



12. ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

Note: This Chapter contains supporting information to the Kenmore Comprehensive Plan. This information may be added, or otherwise updated through the issuance of other SEPA documents, in accordance with the State SEPA regulations, and City regulations.

FACT SHEET

PROJECT TITLE: City of Kenmore Final Integrated Comprehensive Plan and Environmental Impact Statement, and City of Kenmore Final Surface Water Management Plan 2001

PROPOSED ACTION: The proposal is to adopt a Comprehensive Plan for the newly incorporated City of Kenmore to comply with the State Growth Management Act, and to adopt a related Surface Water Management Plan in compliance with State requirements.

The proposal before the City has several components, and for each component, alternatives were reviewed:

- **Goals, Objectives and Policies**

Alternative 1 Policies: Interim Comprehensive Plan, Ord. 98-0027 (considered the "No Action Alternative").

Alternative 2 Goals, Objectives, and Policies: Proposed Land Use, Housing, Transportation, Parks, Recreation and Open Space, Surface Water, Public Services, Utilities, and Capital Facilities Elements presented in Chapters 4 to 11 of the Draft Integrated Comprehensive Plan and Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) issued September 28, 2000.

Preferred Alternative Goals, Objectives, and Policies: Land Use, Housing, Transportation, Parks, Recreation and Open Space, Surface Water, Public Services, Utilities and Capital Facilities Elements presented in **Chapters 4 through 11** of this *Final* Integrated Comprehensive Plan and EIS adopted March 26, 2001.

- **Citywide Land Use Maps**

Alternative 1, 2, or the Preferred Alternative would: a) Protect/maintain single-family residential areas; and b) Concentrate commercial and business uses in similar locations.

Citywide Alternative 1, the Current Kenmore Zoning Map, is based upon interim City land use plans and policies (as shown in Figure LU-3A, Chapter 4A, Draft Integrated Comprehensive Plan and EIS). This alternative would be considered the No Action Alternative, because it continues current plans.

Citywide Alternative 2, is the "Proposed Land Use Map" (as shown in Figure LU-3B, Chapter 4A, Draft Integrated Comprehensive Plan and EIS). Alternative 2 contains a few basic differences from Alternative 1 including: a) Creation of a classification for Institutional uses including government, schools, and public park properties; b) Reclassification of

Industrial properties to other commercial classifications and elimination of the Industrial designation; c) Creation of a classification(s) suitable for Downtown; and, d) Consideration of Joint Study Areas (Refer to Figure INT-1, page 1-3).

Citywide Preferred Alternative, is the Preferred Alternative generally as recommended by the Planning Commission and authorized by the City Council. (This alternative is called the Kenmore Land Use Plan in **Figure LU-3** of this Final Comprehensive Plan and EIS.) The Preferred Alternative is based upon the Alternative 2 Proposed Zoning Map. The Preferred Alternative a) Creates a classification for Institutional uses including government, schools, and public park properties, and, in comparison to Alternative 2, the Preferred Alternative modifies the application of the Public and Private Institution Designation in some cases - adds some properties, removes some properties; b) identical to Alternative 2, the Preferred Alternative reclassifies Industrial properties to other commercial classifications, and eliminates the Industrial designation; c) Incorporates Downtown Concept B as the area for a concentration of smaller-scale civic and mixed uses (called the Strategic Civic Investment Area in **Figure LU-10** of this Final Comprehensive Plan and EIS); d) Identifies three Special Districts in the Downtown Area described below; e) Includes Joint Study Areas with Bothell and Kirkland (refer to Figure INT-1, p. 1-3); f) Reclassifies the former Northshore Utility District office and shops from R-48 to Regional Business to be consistent with the Downtown Concept selected (Concept B) and to be consistent with other properties that front the eastern side of 68th Avenue NE north of SR-522; g) Reclassifies land in the SE Quadrant of SR-522 and 68th Avenue NE as R-24 instead of Regional Business and R-12 to create a transition area; and h) Classifies Bastyr University as R-4 with a Special Study Area District overlay.

- **Downtown Concept Maps**

Downtown Concept A (No Action): Originally presented in the Northshore Community Plan Update and Area Zoning (February 11, 1993), and reflected in the Current Kenmore Zoning Map, this alternative focuses civic investment in an area containing government and civic uses near the intersection of NE 181st Street and 73rd Avenue NE (as shown in Figure LU-8A, Chapter 4B, Draft Integrated Comprehensive Plan and EIS). Mixed-use development would occur in the area northwest of 68th Avenue NE and NE 181st Street, and would develop as market forces would determine.

Downtown Concept B: Concept B would combine civic investment with privately developed mixed-uses in the Northwest quadrant of 68th Avenue NE and Bothell Way (as

shown in Figure LU-8B, Chapter 4B, Draft Integrated Comprehensive Plan and EIS).

Downtown Concept C: Concept C would combine civic investment with privately developed mixed-uses largely in the southeast quadrant of 68th Avenue NE and Bothell Way (as shown in Figure LU-8C of the Draft Integrated Comprehensive Plan and EIS).

Preferred Downtown Concept, is the Preferred Downtown Alternative recommended by the Planning Commission and authorized by the City Council. Downtown Concept B has been selected as the area for a concentration of smaller-scale civic and mixed uses. Refer to **Figure LU-10**, Strategic Civic Investment Area, **Chapter 4B**, of this Final Integrated Comprehensive Plan and EIS. Additionally, the Preferred Downtown Concept includes Special Districts which create different areas of emphasis within the Downtown: Downtown - Community, Downtown - Master Plan Development, and Transportation Coordination Special Districts. Refer to **Figure LU-8, Chapter 4B**, of this Final Integrated Comprehensive Plan and EIS.

- **Conceptual Park Plans**

Alternative 1, Existing Park Maintenance and Improvements, would continue existing park maintenance practices and existing park improvements.

Alternative 2, Proposed Park Conceptual Plans, includes conceptual park improvement plans prepared for Kenmore, Linwood, Logboom, Moorlands, and Wallace-Swamp Creek Parks (summarized in **Table PR-B, Chapter 7**, and depicted in **Appendix C** of this Final Integrated Comprehensive Plan and EIS). Suggested improvements and strategies are intended to be advisory and guide the future preparation of a Park Master Plan for Kenmore.

- **Surface Water Management Plan**

The purpose of the Surface Water Management Plan is to provide guidance to the City of Kenmore for budgeting expenditures, developing policy related to all aspects of surface water management, and day-to-day decisionmaking, including:

- Capital Facility Needs
- Swamp Creek Inter-Jurisdictional Coordination
- Development Regulations and Review
- Enforcement of Development Regulations
- Operation and Maintenance
- Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination
- Public Education and Involvement

- Comprehensive Storm Drainage Mapping
- Funding

Structural and nonstructural solutions/alternatives have been developed for identified problems in each basin.

The Alternatives would be to continue current surface water regulations and “do nothing” in terms of improvements; or, implement the improvements in the Draft Surface Water Management Plan 2000; or implement improvements in the **Final Surface Water Management Plan 2001**.

For purposes of the Environmental Impact Statement, the alternative components can be grouped together as follows:

“Alternative 1” (“No Action” Alternative) consists of:

- Alternative 1 Policies; and
- Citywide Land Use Map Alternative 1; and
- Concentration of civic uses near the intersection of NE 181st Street and 73rd Avenue NE (**Downtown Concept A**) and allowance of privately developed mixed-uses in the northwest and southeast quadrants of 68th Avenue NE and Bothell Way. (Partial implementation of **Downtown Concepts B and C**.) The private mixed-use development would occur in locations allowed in accordance with existing zoning and would be developed in a comparable, but smaller area than with Alternative 2; and
- Continuation of current park maintenance practices and existing improvements; and
- Draft Surface Water Management Plan assuming the “do nothing” alternatives.

“Alternative 2” consists of:

- Alternative 2, Goals, Objectives, and Policies; and
- Citywide Land Use Map Alternative 2; and
- Location of privately-developed mixed uses in the northwest and southeast quadrants of 68th Avenue NE and Bothell Way intersection with civic investment either leading the redevelopment (**Concept B**) or being a part of redevelopment that is privately-initiated (**Concept C**). Mixed-Use development would occur in comparable, but larger geographic areas than Alternative 1 in accordance with proposed land use classifications. Less office uses would occur near the intersection of NE 181st Street and 73rd Avenue NE (**Concept A**) since there would be a concentration of civic uses elsewhere; and
- Proposed Park Conceptual Plans; and

- Draft Surface Water Management Plan assuming alternatives *other than* the “do nothing” action.
- **The “Preferred Alternative”** consists of:
 - Preferred Alternative, Goals, Objectives, and Policies; and
 - Citywide Preferred Alternative Land Use Map; and
 - Location of mixed-uses in the northwest and southeast quadrants of 68th Avenue NE and Bothell Way intersection, with civic investment leading a public and private redevelopment effort occurring in **Concept B** area, and privately-initiated redevelopment occurring in the **Concept C** area. Mixed-use development would occur in slightly smaller areas than Alternative 2, but larger geographic areas than Alternative 1, in accordance with proposed land use classifications. Less office uses would occur near the intersection of NE 181st Street and 73rd Avenue NE (**Concept A**) since there would be a concentration of civic uses elsewhere; and
- Proposed Park Conceptual Plans; and
- **Final Surface Water Management Plan 2001** assuming recommended improvements.

LOCATION:

The Comprehensive Plan and Surface Water Management Plan address property within the City limits as well as two Joint Study Areas. One Joint Study Area is located east of Kenmore City limits and is bounded by NE 180th Street, the Tolt Pipeline, and NE Bothell Way. The second Joint Study Area is located south of the Kenmore City limits and is bounded by Juanita Drive, NE 145th Street, 84th Avenue NE, and Big Finn Hill Park. (Refer to Figure INT-1, page 1-3.)

PROPONENT:

City of Kenmore

LEAD AGENCY:

City of Kenmore
Community Development Department
6700 NE 181st Street
P.O. Box 82607
Kenmore, WA 98028-0607

**RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL/
CONTACT PERSON:**

Bob Sokol, AICP
Community Development Director
(425) 398-8900

**AUTHORS AND PRINCIPAL
CONTRIBUTORS:**

The City of Kenmore Final Integrated Comprehensive Plan and Environmental Impact Statement has been prepared under the direction of the City of Kenmore staff, Planning Commission, and

City Council. Research, analysis, and document preparation were provided by the following firms:

Principal authors:

Bucher, Willis & Ratliff Corporation
2003 Western Avenue, Suite 100
Seattle, Washington 98121
(206) 448-2123

Contributing authors:

Arai/Jackson Architects and Planners
1601 E. John
Seattle, Washington 98112
(206) 323-8800

Common Ground
107 Cherry, Suite 410
Seattle, Washington 98104
(206) 461-4500

Henderson, Young & Company
16700 NE 79th Street
Redmond, Washington 98052
(425) 869-1786

Kato & Warren, Inc.
A division of TranSystems Corp.
2003 Western Avenue, Suite 555
Seattle, Washington 98121
(206) 448-4200

REQUIRED APPROVALS: Kenmore City Council - Adoption
Puget Sound Regional Council – Transportation Element Certification
Washington State Department of Community Development – coordination of state comments

DEIS ISSUE DATE: September 28, 2000

**FINAL INTEGRATED
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN
AND EIS ADOPTION DATE:** March 26, 2001

FEIS ISSUE DATE: April 4, 2001

REVIEW PERIOD No review period applies. Pursuant to WAC 197-11-230, a seven-day waiting period does not apply for a Final Growth Management Act Comprehensive Plan, when the Draft Growth Management Act

Comprehensive Plan document included a Draft EIS, as is the case for Kenmore. The Final EIS and the adoption of the Comprehensive Plan may occur together, notwithstanding the requirements of WAC 197-11-460(5).

**LOCATION OF
BACKGROUND DATA:**

City of Kenmore. See Lead Agency and Responsible Official address and phone number above.

**TYPE AND TIMING OF
SUBSEQUENT SEPA
DOCUMENTS:**

SEPA review will be conducted as appropriate when implementing plans, implementing regulations, amendments, or project-level applications are submitted.

COST OF DOCUMENT:

At the time of issuance, copies of the Final Integrated Comprehensive Plan and Environmental Impact Statement may be purchased for \$25.00 (excluding appendices). Copies are also available for review at Kenmore City Hall (6700 NE 181st Street), and the Kenmore Branch Library (18138 73rd Avenue NE).

INTRODUCTION

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

SEPA REQUIREMENTS

The State Environmental Policy Act or SEPA (RCW 43.21C) requires government officials to consider the environmental consequences of actions they are about to take and seek better or less damaging ways to accomplish those proposed actions. They must consider whether the proposed action will have a probable, significant, adverse environmental impact on the following elements of the natural and built environment: earth, air, water, plants and animals, energy and natural resources, environmental health, land and shoreline use, transportation, and public services and utilities.

SEPA grants each agency the authority to protect environmental quality, and it requires state and local officials to make decisions consistent with the policy set forth in the act. When necessary, it can be used to supplement agencies' authority to address gaps in laws affecting environmental quality. Policies, plans and regulations adopted under the Growth Management Act (GMA) are considered non-project actions subject to SEPA review.

SEPA/GMA INTEGRATION

Sound planning requires establishing objectives, analyzing alternatives, selecting an alternative, and implementing the adopted plan. An environmental impact statement (EIS) is part of the planning process since it analyzes and documents the environmental impacts and tradeoffs of a proposed action. Ideally, environmental analysis is continuous throughout the planning process. Discussion of policies and specific land use designations is informed by analyses of the environmental consequences of those choices.

SEPA and GMA requirements are similar in many ways. Integration of SEPA with GMA eliminates duplication of effort and assures consistency between SEPA and GMA requirements. The planning processes for SEPA and GMA come together at several points:

Public Participation. Both SEPA and GMA recognize public participation and agency coordination as critical to the planning process.

Documents. Both SEPA and GMA require preparation of documents for the public participation and decision-making process, but they each have specific guidelines on the information and analysis that must or should be included.

Visioning. The City of Kenmore conducted a formal EIS scoping process for the Comprehensive Plan in October 1999. During the Fall of 1999, the City's Visioning effort also helped identify the issues of concern to City residents, forming the basis for plan goals, objectives, and policies. In one sense, the Visioning process and other public participation efforts leading to development of the plan's goals and policies could be considered part of the scoping process, in that they address both the natural and built environment and must be internally consistent.

Existing Conditions. Both SEPA and GMA require collection and analysis of information regarding existing conditions.

Goals, Objectives, and Policies. Planning goals, objectives and policies play an important role in the development of the GMA comprehensive plan, and the SEPA evaluation of plan alternatives.

Development and Analysis of Alternatives. The City of Kenmore relied on the Planning Commission to assist in development and analysis of Comprehensive Plan goals, policies and objectives, and alternatives. In the early stages of the development of the Comprehensive Plan, the environmental analysis took the form of presentations, issue papers, and inventory chapters made to the Planning Commission. Spirited discussion with the Planning Commission was prompted by the issues raised at each of their respective meetings.

Impact Analysis. GMA requires collection and analysis of data for natural resource lands, critical areas, the mandatory plan elements (land use, housing, transportation, utilities, and capital facilities), and the siting of essential public facilities. SEPA requires the City to analyze the significant adverse impacts to elements of the natural and built environment that are identified during scoping.

Mitigation. GMA requires strategies to reduce the impacts of growth on the natural and built environment. The same strategies should satisfy SEPA requirements for identifying ways to mitigate the significant adverse impacts identified during environmental review.

SCOPE OF ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The City of Kenmore intends to adopt a Comprehensive Plan and a Surface Water Management Plan in accordance with Growth Management Act and State Department of Ecology requirements.

This Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) provides a broad overview of the environmental impacts of future development under three alternative growth scenarios, and of surface water management alternatives including structural and non-structural solutions. The FEIS was prepared under the State Environmental Policy Act (RCW 43.21C). The scope of the FEIS was established through a scoping process which included publication in a local newspaper, notification of affected agencies, and request for comments on which issues should be addressed in the FEIS. The scope was also influenced by the input of the Planning Commission and the public workshops held throughout the City during the process of plan development.

The City has determined that this non-project action is likely to have a significant adverse impact on the environment, requiring that an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) be prepared in accordance with SEPA [RCW 43.21C.030(2)(c)]. The following is the list of elements of the environment addressed in the environmental analysis of the Comprehensive Plan Alternatives, consistent with the Determination of Significance/Scoping Document issued October 13, 1999:

- **Earth**
- **Air Quality**
- **Surface Water**
- **Fish and Wildlife**
- **Energy/Natural Resources** (water, energy)
- **Land and Shoreline Use** (land use, population, housing, aesthetics, historic and cultural preservation)
- **Transportation**
- **Noise**
- **Public Services & Facilities**
- **Utilities**

The adoption of a comprehensive plan is classified by SEPA as a non-project action. A non-project action is defined as an action that is broader than a single site-specific project and involves decisions on policies, plans, or programs. The EIS for the non-project proposal does not require site specific analyses; instead,

the EIS discusses impacts and alternatives appropriate to the scope of the non-project proposal and to the level of planning for the proposal:

WAC 197-11-442 Contents of EIS on nonproject proposals.

(1) The lead agency shall have more flexibility in preparing EISs on nonproject proposals, because there is normally less detailed information available on their environmental impacts and on any subsequent project proposals. The EIS may be combined with other planning documents.

(2) The lead agency shall discuss impacts and alternatives in the level of detail appropriate to the scope of the nonproject proposal and to the level of planning for the proposal. Alternatives should be emphasized. In particular, agencies are encouraged to describe the proposal in terms of alternative means of accomplishing a stated objective (see WAC 197-11-060 (3)). Alternatives including the proposed action should be analyzed at a roughly comparable level of detail, sufficient to evaluate their comparative merits (this does not require devoting the same number of pages in an EIS to each alternative).

(3) If the nonproject proposal concerns a specific geographic area, site specific analyses are not required, but may be included for areas of specific concern. The EIS should identify subsequent actions that would be undertaken by other agencies as a result of the nonproject proposal, such as transportation and utility systems.

(4) The EIS's discussion of alternatives for a comprehensive plan, community plan, or other areawide zoning or for shoreline or land use plans shall be limited to a general discussion of the impacts of alternate proposals for policies contained in such plans, for land use or shoreline designations, and for implementation measures. The lead agency is not required under SEPA to examine all conceivable policies, designations, or implementation measures but should cover a range of such topics. The EIS content may be limited to a discussion of alternatives which have been formally proposed or which are, while not formally proposed, reasonably related to the proposed action.

DRAFT EIS FORMAT

SEPA requires the following components for a *final* Integrated Document in WAC 197-11-235:

- Fact Sheet
- Environmental Summary
- Concise Analysis of Alternatives
- Comments and Responses
- Appropriate Technical or Other Materials

Except for the comments and responses contained in **Appendix B**, the Kenmore Integrated Comprehensive Plan and EIS contains these components in Chapter 12 following the Environmental Summary.

The Concise Analysis of Alternatives contains the heart of the environmental analysis. For each section of the Concise Analysis of Alternatives, the format is generally as follows:

Affected Environment: This consists of a summary of findings from the Existing Conditions/Inventory descriptions presented in the various Plan Elements.

Impacts: This consists of a concise comparison of impacts associated with the alternative courses of action. The Environmental Summary defines the Alternatives under review.

Mitigation Measures: This section presents mitigation measures that would reduce or eliminate environmental impacts. Mitigation measures include 1) plan features that act as mitigation, 2) applicable regulations and commitments, 3) additional mitigation measures that present ideas for altering the proposed alternatives.

Unavoidable Adverse Impacts: This section indicates where unavoidable adverse impacts are still anticipated to occur considering the proposed mitigation measures.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

As part of the Comprehensive Plan and Surface Water Management Plan preparation, there have been ongoing meetings and activities with the Kenmore Planning Commission and City Council. Public participation efforts have included public workshops, public hearings, outreach to community groups, surveys and other events. Advertisements of the events have included newspaper ads, newspaper articles, legal ads, a mailing list, posting of agendas, etc.

In accordance with SEPA (WAC 197-11-232), the City of Kenmore solicited agency and public comments on the scope of the Draft EIS through a Determination of Significance/Scoping Notice. No comments were received during the 21-day comment period which initiated on October 13, 1999.

In addition, a 60-day comment period was established for the Draft Integrated Comprehensive Plan/Draft EIS and the Draft Surface Water Management Plan between September 28 and November 28, 2000. Comments received were considered and responses prepared (see **Appendix B**).

The Planning Commission held a public workshop on October 17, 2000 to introduce the Draft Integrated Comprehensive Plan and EIS, and Draft Surface Water Management Plan. The Planning Commission held two public hearings during the 60-day comment period on October 24 and November 28, 2000. Prior to Final adoption, the City Council held a public hearing as they considered the proposed Final Integrated Comprehensive Plan and EIS, and proposed Final Surface Water Management Plan on March 12, 2001 which addressed the Preferred Alternative.

ENVIRONMENTAL SUMMARY

PURPOSE AND NEED

The proposal is to adopt a Comprehensive Plan for the recently incorporated City of Kenmore to comply with the State Growth Management Act, and to adopt a related Surface Water Management Plan in compliance with State requirements.

OBJECTIVES

The objectives of the Comprehensive Plan are to adopt a Comprehensive Plan in accordance with the requirements of the Growth Management Act, and to achieve the following principles contained in the Vision Statement:

- A community that is family friendly with a small town feeling, that recognizes its history, and is open to and values diversity
- A community that fosters a sense of belonging and pride, makes use of the vast skills of its citizens, and promotes volunteerism
- A community that has preserved the character of its single-family residential neighborhoods, which offers a range of housing types and prices to ensure an adequate choice of attractive living accommodations, and promotes compatible housing
- A community that actively protects natural and environmentally sensitive areas, significant open space, and trees
- A community with an attractive, vital, pedestrian-oriented city center offering commercial, civic, cultural and park spaces, integrated with higher density housing
- A community with clear design standards creating attractive, functional, and enduring buildings and places
- A community that manages its traffic well, and is united by a safe and effective system of streets, transit routes, sidewalks, and trails, linking significant regional and local destinations
- A community that supports and encourages quality schools, diverse and continuing education opportunities
- A community with a network of parks, trails, open spaces, and recreational facilities providing for passive and active recreation, and waterfront access
- A community with clear public priorities that efficiently and effectively utilizes its public resources
- A community with an economic base that provides for the needs of its citizens and provides quality employment opportunities
- A community that is attentive to, and seeks to provide for, the health, safety, and welfare of all its citizens
- A community that is a good partner with citizens and governments throughout the region
- A community with an informed citizenry working with an open, responsive government that seeks out and integrates public input

The objectives of the Surface Water planning effort are to bring the City of Kenmore into compliance with the minimum standards for surface water management set by the State Department of Ecology, to identify drainage related problems within the City, and to develop a plan of action addressing the

problems. The Surface Water Management Plan (SWMP) should also address all of the elements of both the Basic and Comprehensive Stormwater Program as defined by the Puget Sound Water Quality Management Plan (PSWQMP).

ALTERNATIVE PLAN DESCRIPTION

Proposal and Alternatives

The plan before the and City has several components, and for each component, there are alternatives reviewed in the environmental analysis:

- Goals, Objectives and Policies
- Citywide Land Use Maps
- Downtown Concept Maps
- Conceptual Park Plans
- Surface Water Management Plan

Each component and the alternatives are addressed below. In terms of environmental analysis, the information or conclusions apply to the identified proposal component, or where unspecified, the environmental information or conclusions for the Citywide Alternatives apply to their respective components.

Goals, Objectives, Policies

Three policy alternatives have been developed for consideration:

Policy Alternative 1 (No Action): Interim Comprehensive Plan, Ord. 98-0027. The full set of existing interim policies can be found in Appendix B of the Draft Integrated Comprehensive Plan and Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), issued September 28, 2000. Alternative 1 does not contain Goals and Objectives, but contains policies relevant to Kenmore from the King County Comprehensive Plan and Northshore Community Plan Update and Area Zoning.

Policy Alternative 2: Proposed Land Use, Housing, Transportation, Parks and Recreation, Surface Water, Public Services, Utilities and Capital Facilities Elements presented in Chapters 4 to 11 of the Draft Integrated Comprehensive Plan and EIS, issued September 28, 2000. Some of the Alternative 2 policies are similar to Alternative 1 policies, and where this occurs, a reference to the Alternative 1 policies was made (e.g. U-101)

Preferred Alternative Goals, Objectives, and Policies: Land Use, Housing, Transportation, Parks, Recreation and Open Space, Surface Water, Public Services, Utilities and Capital Facilities Elements presented in **Chapters 4 through 11** of this Final Integrated Comprehensive Plan and EIS dated March 2001.

Table ES-A compares the policy alternatives by major topic.

**TABLE ES-A
POLICY ALTERNATIVE COMPARISON**

TOPIC	POLICY ALTERNATIVE 1	POLICY ALTERNATIVE 2	PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
Land Use, Housing, Economic Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Range of single-family and multi-family densities, with minimum densities in zones with densities of 4 or more units/acre. (However, there is a discrepancy between the policies and the Interim Zoning Code. The City's Interim Zoning Code does not apply minimum density requirements in the R-4, R-6 and R-8 zones.) • Encouragement of mixed-uses in commercial and office areas. • Encouragement of industrial use retention and expansion. • Density bonuses offered in residential (more than 4 units), commercial and office zones. Density bonuses encouraged for affordable housing, energy conservation, historic preservation, and parks/open space. • Encouragement of attached and detached housing in single-family areas. • Promotion of scattered site multi-family where possible. • Establishment of county housing programs, and coordination with State and Federal agencies to facilitate affordable housing. • Mobile home parks encouraged to be retained. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Range of single-family and multi-family densities. Minimum density requirements applied zones with 12 or more units/acre. • Encouragement of mixed-uses in commercial and office areas, with particular attention to Downtown. • Recognition of industrial uses being retained until conversion to commercial use due to market changes. • Density bonuses offered in residential, commercial, and office zones. Density bonuses encouraged for affordable housing, additional pervious surface, parks/open space. In Downtown, density bonuses offered for shared/structured parking and for lot consolidation. A density bonus is added in R-1 zone that is characterized as environmentally sensitive area, which may only be transferred offsite. Downtown identified as density receiving area for offsite density transfers. • Single-family predominance in single-family zones. • Concentration of multi-family in Downtown or along arterials. • Mobile home parks may be retained, but due to economic life of mobile homes, potential conversion may 	<p>Same as Alternative 2, with the following additional features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification that there may be more than one community center in Kenmore. • Definitions of land use districts: residential, commercial, Downtown, Public and Private Institutions, and Special Study Area. • Promotion of Uniform Building Code review to determine measures to achieve desired densities (e.g. allowing more floors of wood frame construction). • Identification of the need to conduct a detailed stream and wetland inventory and delineation in Swamp Creek area, and to fully consider appropriate uses, densities, and incentives to achieve environmental protection, a networked open space and trail system, and development consistent with desired neighborhood character. • Creation of two Housing sub-elements to emphasize important policies: Residential Neighborhoods and Affordable Housing Sub-Elements. • Clarification that housing for persons with special needs can apply to any income level.

TOPIC	POLICY ALTERNATIVE 1	POLICY ALTERNATIVE 2	PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
		<p>occur. Promotion of programs to help fund relocation into nearby affordable housing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addition of a Public/Private Institution zone to facilitate master planning and retention of institutional and recreational uses. • Support for county programs, and coordination with State and Federal agencies to facilitate affordable housing. Also, identification of local role in promoting housing for all economic segments. 	
Downtown	Civic concentration focused away from commercial areas.	Promote a mix of uses in Downtown whereby civic investment can spur private redevelopment.	<p>Same as Alternative 2, with the following refinements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reference to the selected Downtown Concept. • Reference to Special Districts: Downtown – Community, Downtown – Master Plan Development, and Transportation Coordination Special Districts. • Emphasis on the need to create a Transit Hub in the Downtown.
Community Design	Policies provide design guidance, addressing Kenmore as a mixed-use activity center with higher density and intensity infill development, site design reflecting natural characteristics, compatibility in style and scale between uses of different intensities, promotion of alternate modes of travel, and streetscape/landscape improvements particularly in central Kenmore.	Policies provide design guidance, addressing Kenmore as a mixed-use activity center with higher density and intensity infill development, site design reflecting natural characteristics, compatibility in style and scale between uses of different intensities, promotion of alternate modes of travel, and streetscape/landscape improvements particularly in central Kenmore. There is additional emphasis on increasing	<p>Same as Alternative 2, with the following refinements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modification of the list of “gateways” into the community – add Simonds Road and future Downtown Transit Hub.

TOPIC	POLICY ALTERNATIVE 1	POLICY ALTERNATIVE 2	PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
		vegetation in the community and compatible residential development standards. A design review process is promoted as a new local program.	
Essential Public Facilities	Guidance for review of essential public facilities.	Guidance for review of essential public facilities. There is additional focus on local review procedures.	Same overall direction as Alternative 2, with the policies streamlined and now located in the Capital Facilities Element.
Natural Environment	Protect critical areas.	Protect critical areas. Also address noise and light and glare.	Same as Alternative 2 with the following refinements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of noise-impact areas and noise mitigation options (based on Draft EIS). • Strengthening enforcement of wetland alteration violations. • Clarification of fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas in Kenmore, and recommendation to conduct a local process to identify fish, wildlife, and plant species of local importance. • More emphasis on the City's response to Federal 4(d) rule.
Shoreline	Address shoreline environments and uses in accordance with the Shoreline Management Act.	Same – adopt <u>King County Shoreline Master Program</u> as an interim element.	Same – adopt <u>King County Shoreline Master Program</u> as an interim element, but corrections made to add shoreline policies omitted in Draft Integrated Comprehensive Plan and EIS.
Transportation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support of alternate modes of travel. Emphasis on transit improvements as well as capital improvements. Improvements should be in place to support growth at time of or within six years of development. Allow public and private streets. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support of alternate modes of travel. Emphasis on transit improvements as well as capital improvements. Improvements should be in place to support growth at time of or within six years of development. • Focus on support of Downtown, and local transportation. 	Same as Alternative 2, with adjustments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creation of two sub-elements, particularly to emphasize transit and alternative modes: Transportation Facility, Level of Service, and Funding Sub-Element and Transit and Alternative Mode Sub-Element.

TOPIC	POLICY ALTERNATIVE 1	POLICY ALTERNATIVE 2	PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
		<p>local circulator system.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change in functional classification for roads. • Emphasis on completing a pedestrian/non-motorized transportation network. • Direction to minimize use of local access tracts in favor of minor access streets to minimize impacts to neighborhood character and to achieve more regular street pattern. • Direction that new streets should be publicly dedicated. Encouragement of existing private streets to be maintained consistently and encourage ultimate inclusion into the public street system. • Establishment of sidewalk priorities for arterial and local streets. • Support of Air Harbor, and ways to minimize conflicts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Elimination of proposed 83rd Place NE extension (bridge) option. • Identification of potential alternative emergency vehicle routes in areas with severe congestion. • Recognition and encouragement of potential regional ferry services on Lake Washington. • Emphasis on maintaining HOV lanes for transit only. • Additional emphasis on multi-agency coordination regarding SR-522. • Encouragement to study signal timing with WSDOT, particularly at SR-522 and 68th Avenue NE.
Parks and Recreation	Emphasizes regional park system.	Provide local park and recreation services, with maintenance and acquisition priorities. Coordinate with regional park and recreation providers.	<p>Same as Alternative 2 with the following refinements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promotion of concept to identify and consider regional and local views for pedestrians and drivers. • Identification of important view corridors to Lake Washington and the Sammamish River, and methods to retain and enhance them (based in part on the Draft EIS recommendations). • Selection of an Interim Level of Service Standard for Local Parks, 2

TOPIC	POLICY ALTERNATIVE 1	POLICY ALTERNATIVE 2	PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
			acres per 1,000 population.
Surface Water	Policies address floodplain management and water quality issues. Emphasis on regional programs, and watershed based approach. Emphasis on non-structural solutions.	Policies address floodplain management and water quality issues. Additional policies emphasize coordination with adjacent jurisdictions regarding surface water. Support for regional facilities. Emphasis on regional solutions to flooding at Swamp Creek.	Same as Alternative 2, with minor wording refinements to policies that do not alter intent.
Public Services	Address public services provided by County, and coordination with special districts.	Address public services provided by City, and coordination with special district providers. Emphasis on citizen involvement. Local focus on human services, and support of non-profit and regional programs.	Same as Alternative 2 with the following refinements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More emphasis on inventorying educational facilities and programs available to Kenmore. • Specific recognition of Senior Citizen programs and needs.
Utilities	Addresses electricity, natural gas, telecommunication, cable and other utilities. Emphasis on coordination with service providers.	Addresses electricity, natural gas, telecommunication, cable and other utilities. Emphasis on coordination with service providers. Additional policies address undergrounding lines, and co-location of utilities to minimize visual impacts. Potential for local solid waste plan. Emphasis on coordination with Utility District.	Same as Alternative 2, with the following adjustments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refinement of policies directing when sewer should be extended to existing and new development. • Requiring utilities to define alternative routes to avoid impacts to environmentally sensitive areas. • Encouraging creation of a funding mechanism for undergrounding utilities in developed areas. • Additional emphasis on energy conservation, such as reuse of building materials.

TOPIC	POLICY ALTERNATIVE 1	POLICY ALTERNATIVE 2	PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
Capital Facilities	Addresses needed capital improvements to support land use plan.	Partially addressed until Preferred Alternative is selected.	Capital Facilities Element completed to address needed capital improvements to support land use plan, including City facilities, library, community center, parks, surface water, transportation, as well as Utility and School District Facilities.

Source: Bucher, Willis & Ratliff Corporation

Citywide Land Use Concepts

Alternative 1, the Current Kenmore Zoning Map, is based upon current City land use plans and policies. This alternative would be considered the No Action Alternative, because it continues current plans. Alternative 2, the Proposed Land Use Map, contains a few basic differences from Alternative 1 in terms of addressing Institutional Uses, reclassifying Industrial Properties, adding Downtown Concepts, and including Joint Study Areas. The Citywide Preferred Alternative is essentially a refinement of Alternative 2 with some Institutional and Downtown adjustments. Alternatives 1 and 2 are depicted on Figures LU-3A and LU-3B, Chapter 4A in the Draft Integrated Comprehensive Plan and EIS. The Preferred Alternative is the Kenmore Land Use Plan in **Figure LU-3, Chapter 4A**, of this Final Integrated Comprehensive Plan and EIS. The similarities and differences are based upon assumptions as follows:

Assumptions for Alternatives 1, 2, and Preferred

- Protect/maintain single-family residential areas
- Concentrate commercial and business uses in similar locations where they are currently located

Additional Assumptions for Alternatives 2, and Preferred

- Consider creation of a classification for Institutional uses including government, schools, and public park properties
- Consider reclassification of Industrial properties to other commercial classifications and eliminate Industrial designation
- Create a classification(s) suitable for Downtown
- Continue to evaluate Joint Study Areas

Citywide Preferred Alternative - Refinements Beyond Alternative 2

- Modify the application of the Public and Private Institution Designation in some cases (add some properties, remove some properties)
- Incorporate Downtown Concept B (Strategic Civic Investment Area) as the area for a concentration of smaller-scale civic and mixed uses
- Identify three Special Districts in the Downtown Area described below
- Reclassify the former Northshore Utility District office and shops from R-48 to Regional Business to be consistent with the Downtown Concept selected and to be consistent with other properties that front the eastern side of 68th Avenue NE north of SR-522
- Reclassify land in the SE Quadrant of SR-522 and 68th Avenue NE as R-24 instead of Regional Business and other residential zones to create a transition area

- Classify Bastyr University (St. Thomas Seminary property) as R-4 with a Special Study Area District overlay.

Downtown Concepts

Because the creation of a Downtown core is a key tenet of the Vision Statement, the Plan focuses on creation of a central mixed-use area. During the development of the alternatives, the following principles were considered:

- Public investment decisions should be made in a strategic manner to stimulate and/or complement private investment
- Public investments should be oriented toward the center of the City, the intersection of 68th Avenue NE and SR-522
- Mixed-use development should be encouraged in the Downtown
- Environmental preservation and enhancement, including the introduction of green spaces Downtown, is encouraged
- Public access to the waterfront is desirable
- Public places are important
- Pedestrian amenities and pedestrian-oriented development are preferred
- Multi-modal transportation opportunities should be enhanced
- The appearance of SR-522 should be improved.

With these principles in mind, three Alternative Downtown Concepts were prepared:

Downtown Concept A (No Action): Originally presented in the Northshore Community Plan Update and Area Zoning, and reflected in the Current Kenmore Zoning Map, this alternative focuses civic investment in an area already containing government and civic uses near the intersection of NE 181st Street and 73rd Avenue NE. Mixed-use development would occur in the area northwest of 68th Avenue NE and 181st Street and would develop as market forces would determine.

Downtown Concept B: Concept B would combine civic investment with privately developed mixed-uses in the Northwest quadrant of 68th Avenue NE and Bothell Way.

Downtown Concept C: Concept C would combine civic investment with privately developed mixed-uses largely in the southeast quadrant of 68th Avenue NE and Bothell Way. Mixed-use development would occur in the area northwest of 68th Avenue NE and 181st Street and would develop as market forces would determine.

Preferred Downtown Concept, is the Preferred Downtown Alternative recommended by the Planning Commission and authorized by the City Council. Downtown Concept B has been selected as the area for a concentration of smaller-scale civic and mixed uses. Refer to **Figure LU-10**, Strategic Civic Investment Area, **Chapter 4B**, of this Final Integrated Comprehensive Plan and EIS. Additionally, the Preferred Downtown Plan includes Special Districts which create different areas of emphasis within the Downtown: Downtown - Community, Downtown - Master Plan Development, and Transportation Coordination Special Districts. Refer to **Figure LU-8, Chapter 4B**, of this Final Integrated Comprehensive Plan and EIS.

Table ES-B identifies features common to Downtown Concepts A through C as well as differences.

**TABLE ES-B
DOWNTOWN CONCEPT COMPARISON**

FEATURES IN COMMON		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall street and circulation patterns • Pedestrian connection system • Walking paths / trail loop around Downtown • Increased shoreline public access pedestrian links to Swamp Creek Park • Pedestrian links throughout city center • Large blocks broken up with pedestrian walkways • Existing street pattern remains with revisions of intersections at: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 68th Avenue NE and NE 181st Street – 68th Avenue NE and NE 175th Street – NE 181st Street and 73rd Avenue NE • Sidewalks and street trees added throughout • Wetlands and heron rookery remain protected 		
CONCEPT A FEATURES	CONCEPT B FEATURES (STRATEGIC CIVIC INVESTMENT AREA)	CONCEPT C FEATURES
<p><u>Land uses:</u> Land use mix includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Civic (existing sheriff, fire department, park and ride, library and potential new civic uses) • Multifamily residential uses • Office and service uses • Retail along SR-522 • Primarily single-use buildings <p><u>Key features:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing zoning stays • Continuation of existing development trends and land use patterns • New development fits in undeveloped/ under-used parcels • Primarily private sector development on individual lots • New civic uses could occur in office zone as infill with public activity node at 73rd Ave. NE & NE 181st St. intersection • Existing street patterns remain with minor 73rd Ave. NE/ NE 181st intersection realignment • Street trees and sidewalks added to all streets • Surface parking • Wetland and heron rookery remains 	<p><u>Land uses:</u> Land use mix includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Civic uses (existing: city hall, park-and-ride) • New: community center, library, senior center, public plazas) • Multi-family residential housing • Office and service uses • Retail services along SR-522 • Mixed-use and single use buildings <p><u>Key features:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New “mixed-use” zone designation • New development pattern after land assembly • Public investment leads land assembly and public/private partnership for redevelopment • Reconfiguration of existing and new civic uses into a core as Downtown anchor • Location of civic center at 68th Ave. NE and SR-522 anchors development • Area redesigned and developed as a “master plan” • Structured parking includes park & ride closer to transit stops on SR-522 • Public acquisition of block between NE 181 St. & SR-522 along with pedestrian bridge links civic core to LakePointe • Realignment of NE 181st St. and 68th Ave. NE intersection • Retail/services oriented to SR-522 • Street trees and sidewalks added to all streets • Pedestrian walkways and open spaces link area together 	<p><u>Land uses:</u> Land use mix includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New civic uses (city hall, community & senior center, library, public plazas) • Multi-family residential housing • Offices / service uses • Mixed-use and single use buildings <p><u>Key features:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New mixed-use zoning • New development and land use patterns • New street pattern • Privately led redevelopment with public use incorporated • Little land assembly required • Public uses & civic center oriented toward river front & Open space trails • Retail/ services oriented toward new Kenmore loop road, Burke-Gilman trail, SR-522 • Area designed as master planned development • Structured parking • Pedestrian walkways and open spaces link area together • Street trees and sidewalks added to all streets

Source: Arai/Jackson Architects and Planners

Conceptual Park Plans

Park opportunities and constraints, described Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Element, along with results of the Kenmore Community Survey conducted in the Fall of 1999, have guided the preparation of park improvement recommendations for the five parks to be transferred from King County to the City of Kenmore: Kenmore Park, Linwood Park, Logboom Park, Moorlands Park, and Wallace-Swamp Creek Park. Conceptual park plans are intended to be advisory and conceptual only, and to help guide the preparation of a Citywide Parks Plan. **Table ES-C** lists the potential park enhancements. Conceptual park plans are included in **Appendix C**.

**TABLE ES-C
POTENTIAL FUTURE PARK IMPROVEMENTS**

POTENTIAL IMPROVEMENTS	ADDITIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS
GENERAL	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uniform signage and directional signage. • The need for lighting depending on safety and park use. • The need for restrooms (permanent or temporary facilities) depending on park use, safety, and cost. 	
KENMORE PARK	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase awareness of Kenmore Park. • Increase surveillance of park users and grounds. • Better Park edge definition along road frontages. • New sidewalks along 68th Avenue NE and NE 170th Street. • Better Park signage. • Improve maintenance of facilities, planting areas. • Boardwalk along Sammamish River and View Point at River • Selectively thin shoreline vegetation for views from Park. • Improve access to Boat Launch. • Remodel existing buildings (use?) • Improve picnic area and existing restrooms. • Replace irrigation system. • Regrade grass area and improve drainage. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide increased shoreline and water access. • Provide view corridors into the park. • Improve the visibility of the main driveway on Simonds Road. • Increase the coverage over the picnic areas. • Improve the visibility of the picnic areas by limbing trees and/or explore moving the picnic area to a more central location. • Extend walking paths through the rhododendrons. • Explore filling in the abandoned ponds. • Improve the aesthetic and functional quality of the wetland. • Conduct a feasibility study to determine use options and the redevelopment potential of existing buildings by private and non-profit groups. • Improve the visibility of the pedestrian entrance from Juanita drive through better signage, widening access and increased visibility. • Explore the possibility of locating a stormwater detention pond near the wetlands. • Explore the cause and potential solutions for wetness in the open areas.
LINWOOD PARK	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Curb and gutter/ paved parallel parking at 193rd Avenue NE edge. • Increase park edge and grass maintenance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision of a pedestrian connection to NE 190th Street. • Increase visibility to the south particularly through

POTENTIAL IMPROVEMENTS	ADDITIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upgrade play area and picnic facilities. • Improve signage. • Repair existing paths and establish through-trail. • New fence on park property all around. • Trim vegetation and clean trails in wooded area. • Clean up stream. 	<p>the wooded area and along the stream.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve the playground equipment and retain its location in the north end of the park to ensure accessibility and visibility. • Clean up and maintain the existing trails and stream. • Provide sidewalks on the south side of NE 193rd street. • Explore the possibility of a stormwater detention facility in the southern portion of the park provided it is designed to be aesthetically pleasing, unobtrusive and proportional to the scale of the park. • Explore the provision of parking on a widened shoulder.
LOGBOOM PARK	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expand beach along shoreline. • Thin vegetation to improve views and access. • Stabilize shoreline with stone, native planting. • Relocate 61st Avenue NE Connector at SR-522 and NE 175th Street. • Improve salmon migration potential of creek at 61st Avenue NE. • Bioswales for stormwater filtration/ management • Improve frequency of restroom and park maintenance. • Expand grass areas around restroom. • Renovate dock: lighting, railings, floating picnic platforms • Expand parking • Reinstall children's play area with seating facing it • Develop grass area by dock as interpretive display. • Buffer east end of park at condominiums. • Enhance landscaping of Burke-Gilman Trail 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve the venting of the pump station to reduce odor. • Implement noise reduction techniques for the pump station. • Explore options for increasing parking opportunities. • Provide pedestrian access from Bothell Way. • Expand beach area and access for views without encouraging swimming opportunities. • Expand the view corridors along the shoreline. • Provide a pedestrian connection at the west end of the park to the Burke-Gilman trail. • Provide a loop walking trail along the shoreline that connects to the existing park trail. • Explore the possibility of enhancing the on-site stream. • Provide playground equipment. • Improve utility provision and lighting (especially to support special day and night uses e.g. Christmas ships). • Explore locating "harbor steps" in front of a proposed interpretive center as a waterfront seating area. • Improve quality of grass area. • Work with adjoining property owners to explore connections from the park to the LakePointe property. • Explore the feasibility of providing a small concert/stage area on top of the pump station. • Enhance the landscape buffer on the east side of the park. • Provide a pedestrian connection from the existing

POTENTIAL IMPROVEMENTS	ADDITIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS
	<p>parking lot to the Burke-Gilman trail.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enhance the landscaping adjoining the Burke-Gilman trail.
<p style="text-align: center;">MOORLANDS PARK</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shared parking with school. Potential shared parking with church. Higher standard of park maintenance. New play area in former park parking lot. Smooth out/reseed grass play areas. Improve signage at park entrances. Loop trail on sloped eastern half. Improved park signage. Improved 81st Avenue NE entry. 	
<p style="text-align: center;">WALLACE-SWAMP CREEK PARK</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to determine desired level of use, type (natural/passive or active recreation). Parking area of 73rd Avenue NE in northern portion of park. Restrooms close to parking and 73rd Avenue NE. Rebuilt 73rd Avenue with widened shoulder (west side). Improved signage for locating park entrances and parking. Northern park area for open grass meadows, interpretive landscape with nature trails. Nature trails for southern park property in forested ravine – connect to school; overall: develop nature trails along stream and forested areas. New fences at park property boundaries. Improve Swamp Creek channel for salmon habitat/migration. 	

Source: Arai/Jackson Architects and Planners; City of Kenmore

Surface Water Management Concepts

Surface water management is addressed in the Kenmore Comprehensive Plan through the inclusion of a Surface Water Element developed concurrently with the **Final Kenmore Surface Water Management Plan 2001**. This Plan is an implementing plan to the Kenmore Comprehensive Plan. As the documents were prepared in tandem, they have been circulated for review at the same time, and both have been analyzed in the Environmental Impact Statement contained in this Integrated document.

The purpose of the Surface Water Management Plan is to provide guidance to the City of Kenmore for budgeting expenditures, developing policy related to all aspects of surface water management, and day-to-day decisionmaking, including:

- Capital Facility Needs
- Swamp Creek Inter-Jurisdictional Coordination
- Development Regulations and Review
- Enforcement of Development Regulations
- Operation and Maintenance
- Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination
- Public Education and Involvement
- Comprehensive Storm Drainage Mapping
- Funding

Components that are most relevant to the environmental analysis are briefly described below.

Capital Facility Needs

Identified surface water problems were separated into two groups based on the complexity and cost of their solutions. Two programs are recommended to address these problems:

A **Small Works Drainage Program** is recommended to resolve small drainage problems typically reported by citizens. A categorization and prioritization system has been developed to help Kenmore staff determine which problems warrant a publicly-funded solution, and in what order they should be addressed. An annual budget of \$50,000 is recommended for this program.

A **Capital Improvement Program** is recommended to address the larger drainage problems with solutions costing more than \$30,000. For each of these larger problems, alternative solutions were identified and evaluated. A 6-year Capital Improvement Plan has been proposed costing approximately \$100,000 per year. This amount does not include projects to address regional Swamp Creek flooding. Swamp Creek flood reduction projects will be funded by mitigation payments from King County for planned regional sanitary sewer projects and by the participation of upstream agencies. A separate study has been prepared to address Swamp Creek projects and the spending of the King County mitigation payments. The results of that study have been incorporated into the final version of the Surface Water Management Plan. In comparison to the Draft Surface Water Management Plan, the Final Surface Water Management Plan includes results of the **Swamp Creek Flood Reduction Study**, prepared to address Swamp Creek projects and the spending of King County mitigation payments.

Swamp Creek Inter-Jurisdictional Coordination

Due to Kenmore's position at the end of the Swamp Creek watershed, and due to the increasing frequency and severity of flooding in Kenmore caused by upstream development in Snohomish County, an Interlocal Agreement with upstream jurisdictions is needed that delineates the role, responsibilities, and actions of each jurisdiction in managing stormwater in the watershed. Kenmore has already begun the process leading to an interlocal agreement by funding a Swamp Creek Study to assess previous studies of the problem and propose an action plan, and by hosting meetings that have included staff representatives and elected officials from the each of the upstream jurisdictions.

Illicit Discharge Elimination and Detection

A new program is recommended to identify and eliminate pollutants entering the storm drainage system. Such a program would include individual site inspections and in some cases chemical or biological sampling to identify water quality code violations (KCC Chapter 9.12). This program would be coordinated with a recommended "Business for Clean Water" public education program, which has goals of educating business owners of required Best Management Practices to protect water quality. This new program is needed to comply with requirements of the Puget Sound Water Quality Action Plan, Phase II NPDES permitting, and anticipated requirements of a Tri-County ESA Section 4(d) rule.

Alternative Components Grouped

For purposes of the Environmental Impact Statement, the alternative components can be grouped together as follows:

"Alternative 1" ("No Action" Alternative) consists of:

- Alternative 1 Policies; and
- Citywide Land Use Map Alternative 1; and
- Concentration of civic uses near the intersection of NE 181st Street and 73rd Avenue NE (**Downtown Concept A**) and allowance of privately developed mixed-uses in the northwest and southeast quadrants of 68th Avenue NE and Bothell Way. (Partial implementation of **Downtown Concepts B and C**). The private mixed-use development would occur in locations allowed in accordance with existing zoning and would be developed in a comparable but smaller area than with Alternative 2; and
- Continuation of current park maintenance practices and existing improvements; and
- Draft Surface Water Management Plan assuming the "do nothing" alternatives.

"Alternative 2" consists of:

- Alternative 2, Goals, Objectives, and Policies; and
- Citywide Land Use Map Alternative 2; and
- Location of privately-developed mixed-use in the northwest and southeast quadrants of 68th Avenue NE and Bothell Way intersection with civic investment either leading the redevelopment (**Concept B**) or being a part of redevelopment that is privately-initiated (**Concept C**). Mixed-Use development would occur in comparable, but larger geographic areas than Alternative 1 in accordance with proposed land use classifications. Less office uses would occur near the intersection of NE 181st Street and 73rd Avenue NE (**Concept A**) since there would be a concentration of civic uses elsewhere; and
- Proposed Park Conceptual Plans; and

- Draft Surface Water Management Plan assuming alternatives *other than* the “do nothing” action.

The “**Preferred Alternative**” consists of:

- Preferred Alternative, Goals, Objectives, and Policies; and
- Citywide Preferred Alternative Land Use Map; and
- Location of mixed-uses in the northwest and southeast quadrants of 68th Avenue NE and Bothell Way intersection, with civic investment leading a public and private redevelopment effort occurring in **Concept B** area, and privately-initiated redevelopment occurring in the **Concept C** area. Mixed-use development would occur in slightly smaller areas than Alternative 2, but larger geographic areas than Alternative 1, in accordance with proposed land use classifications. Less office uses would occur near the intersection of NE 181st Street and 73rd Avenue NE (**Concept A**) since there would be a concentration of civic uses elsewhere; and
- Proposed Park Conceptual Plans; and
- Final Surface Water Management Plan assuming recommended improvements.

DEVELOPMENT CAPACITY OF LAND USE ALTERNATIVES

Assuming development in accordance with the Citywide Land Use Alternatives, the Planning Area (City plus Joint Study Areas) would achieve greater numbers of dwelling units, commercial square feet, and a reduction in Industrial Square Feet. Refer to **Table ES-D**.

For purposes of the analysis, the following assumptions were made about Downtown redevelopment that affect the Citywide growth numbers in **Table ES-D**:

- For the Preferred Alternative, Downtown Concepts B and C are studied together since future zoning would allow for both to occur; development in the southeast quadrant of 68th Avenue NE/Bothell Way intersection (Concept C) would likely be developed based on market forces whereas development in the northwest quadrant of the same intersection (Concept B) would likely require City participation or incentives. In comparison to Alternative 2, the Concept C area would be a little smaller by not including mobile home property on the east, but the Concept C area would be larger than that studied for Alternative 1 as noted below. Additionally, the office figure assumes a reduced demand for office at the intersection of 181st Street/73rd Avenue NE due to concentration of civic uses elsewhere in the Downtown.
- For Citywide Land Use Alternative 2, Downtown Concepts B and C are studied together since future zoning would allow for both to occur; development in the southeast quadrant of 68th Avenue NE/Bothell Way intersection (Concept C) would likely be developed based on market forces, whereas development in the northwest quadrant of the same intersection (Concept B) would likely require City participation or incentives. Additionally, the office figure assumes a reduced demand for office at the intersection of 181st Street/73rd Avenue NE due to concentration of civic uses elsewhere in the Downtown.
- For Citywide Alternative 1, civic uses would be concentrated at the intersection of NE 181st Street and 73rd Avenue NE, and privately-initiated mixed-use development would occur in the northwest and southeast quadrants of the 68th Avenue NE/Bothell Way intersection. However, the amount of acres assumed in the southeast quadrant is less than for Citywide Alternative 2 because the Industrial Zone would not change to the Regional Business Zone. Also, in comparison to Alternative 2, the block between 65th Avenue NE and 68th Avenue NE and fronting Bothell Way would not redevelop as it is assumed that market forces alone would not spur redevelopment at this location.

Outside of Downtown, there is about a 100-unit difference between Citywide Alternative 1 and Citywide Alternative 2 or the Preferred Alternative, which is due to the potential for single-family development in the Bastyr University Area under the existing zoning allowances of Citywide Alternative 1.

The estimated current population of the Planning Area is 21,230 using 1999 dwelling unit counts multiplied by a household size of 2.49¹. Assuming a household size of 2.4², one could expect 34,162 persons total in the Planning Area in 2020 under Alternative 1, 35,414 under Alternative 2, and 35,119 under the Preferred Alternative.

The net increase in population for Alternative 1 would equal 12,932. The net increase in population for Alternative 2 would equal 14,184. Last, the net increase in population for the Preferred Alternative would be 13,889.

Without considering the Joint Study Areas, the total population for the City limits would equal 30,352 under Alternative, 1, and 31,606 under Alternative 2, and 31,339 under the Preferred Alternative.³

Downtown development would be a large portion of the net population and development increase as shown in Table ES-E. The difference in Alternatives is largely explained by the different amount of area developed for a downtown as described above.

The figures in **Table ES-D** are for the 20-year planning horizon. Refer to **Table DE-G, Chapter 3**, for 6-year development estimates that are applicable to the three alternatives. **Appendix A** also contains 6-year and 20-year development projections.

PRIOR ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

Several existing environmental inventories and documents prepared as part of previous planning actions are referenced in the EIS for the Kenmore Comprehensive Plan and related Surface Water Management Plan. These documents include:

- King County Planning and Community Development Division. Northshore Community Plan Update and Area Zoning, February 11, 1993.
- King County Department of Parks, Planning and Resources. Supplemental Draft EIS, King County Comprehensive Plan, June 1994.
- King County Department of Parks, Planning and Resources. Final EIS, King County Comprehensive Plan, November 1994.
- King County Department of Development and Environmental Services. Draft Supplemental EIS, LakePointe Mixed Use Master Plan, November 1997.

¹ In 1999, a land use inventory was completed for purposed of the Kenmore Comprehensive Plan. The 2.49 household size is derived from year 2000 OFM population figures for the City of Kenmore because OFM reduced the City of Kenmore's population from 17,168 in 1999 to 16,890 in 2000, due to changes in OFM household size data. Therefore, year 2000 household size was utilized along with 1999 dwelling unit counts to approximate the base year (1999) population of the Planning Area.

² A household size of 2.4 is based upon PSRC projections for the year 2020 for FAZ 5535, derived from dividing PSRC's estimated future population by PSRC's estimated future total dwellings. Although PSRC's future growth projections are different than those analyzed for the Alternatives reviewed in the Kenmore Comprehensive Plan/EIS, use of the PSRC numbers to develop future household size estimates is considered conservative and appropriate for planning purposes since PSRC's household size estimate for the Year 2000 is close to the State Office of Financial Management household size numbers for the Year 2000.

³ The 2000 OFM population estimate shows 16,890 City residents as of April, 2000. Based on a 1999 dwelling unit count of single-family and multi-family dwellings and the 2000 household size (explained in footnote 2), the estimated 1999 population would equal 17,836. The Northshore Utility District estimates Kenmore's 1999 population as 18,946. The District also projects fewer residents in Kenmore in 2020 (23,835), due to different assumptions about past trends, future lower development densities, and lower household sizes. See **Chapter 12, Concise Analysis of Alternatives** for more information

**TABLE ES-D
EXISTING AND FUTURE DEVELOPMENT – PLANNING AREA
(CITY PLUS JOINT STUDY AREAS)**

USE	1999 (Existing Land Use Base Year)	NET 2020 CITYWIDE ALT. 1	NET 2020 CITYWIDE ALT. 2	NET 2020 CITYWIDE PREFERRED	TOTAL 2020 CITYWIDE ALT. 1	TOTAL 2020 CITYWIDE ALT. 2	TOTAL 2020 CITYWIDE PREFERRED
Single-family Dwellings	5,706	1,900	1,800	1,793	7,606	7,506	7,499
Multi-Family Dwellings	2,820	3,808	4,430	4,314	6,628	7,250	7,134
Commercial Gross Square Feet ⁴	688,597	696,178	968,299	902,306	1,384,775	1,656,896	1,590,903
Office Gross Square Feet	143,288	627,248	869,570	803,577	770,536	1,012,858	946,865
Industrial Gross Square Feet	341,494	-103,012	-278,775	-278,775	238,482	62,719	62,719

Source: Bucher, Willis & Ratliff Corporation

⁴ The amount of commercial square feet does not include hotels. Currently, there are 42 hotel units, and in the future there will be an additional 150 hotel units, due to the LakePointe project.

**TABLE ES-E
DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT STATISTICS**

CONCEPT	ACRES	DWELLING UNITS	NET COMMERCIAL SF	NET OFFICE SF	NET INDUSTRIAL SF
ALTERNATIVE 1					
A	19.20	125.04	10,802.88	38,043.40	
B	8.90	365.61	4,325.62	76,659.62	
C	25.26	673.52	306,956.58	306,956.58	-62,365.00
TOTAL	53.36	1,164.17	322,085.08	421,659.60	-62,365.00
ALTERNATIVE 2					
A	19.20	125.04	10,802.88	9,510.85	
B	19.28	514.13	38,464.57	169,236.57	
C	36.51	973.60	417,901.79	424,467.79	-130,661.00
TOTAL	74.99	1,612.77	467,169.25	603,215.22	-130,661.00
PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE					
A	19.20	125.04	10,802.88	9,510.85	
B	19.28	514.13	38,464.57	169,236.57	
C	31.08	828.80	351,909.70	358,475.70	-130,661.00
TOTAL	69.56	1,467.97	401,177.15	537,223.12	-130,661.00

Notes:

1. The estimates of future dwellings assume the density of the LakePointe development.
2. The estimates of commercial and office development assume the floor area ratio (FAR) of the LakePointe development, and a lot coverage (90%) consistent with the RB zone.
3. For Downtown Concept B area, which is anticipated to be more community-serving than region serving, an additional reduction in the development potential (20 percent) was included.
4. The development estimates assume that 50 percent of Concept B and C areas will have residential uses, 25 percent will have commercial retail, and 25 percent will have office uses.
5. The office figure for Downtown Concept A was reduced in Citywide Alternative 2 and the Preferred Alternative, showing a reduced demand for office due to the concentration of civic uses elsewhere.
6. The existing commercial and office square footages were subtracted from the gross development estimates to obtain net figures.

Source: Bucher, Willis & Ratliff Corporation

- King County Department of Development and Environmental Services. Final Supplemental EIS, LakePointe Mixed Use Master Plan, July 1998.

Information from the above documents and reports is hereby incorporated by reference. The cited documents are available for review at the offices of the Lead Agency as noted in the Fact Sheet of this Final EIS.

PHASED ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

SEPA encourages the use of phased environmental review to focus on issues that are ready for decision and to exclude from consideration issues already decided or not yet ready for decision-making [WAC 197-11-060(5)]. Phased review is appropriate where the sequence of a proposal is from a programmatic document such as an integrated Comprehensive Plan/EIS to other documents that are narrower in scope such as for a site specific analysis.

The City of Kenmore is using phased review, as authorized by SEPA, in its environmental review of growth management planning actions. The analysis in this Integrated Comprehensive Plan/EIS will be used to review the environmental impacts of other actions, including implementing development regulations, and, where applicable, individual projects.

Additional environmental review of the subsequent actions will occur as they are drafted or proposed in a phased process. This will permit incremental review when subsequent implementing actions require a more detailed evaluation and as additional information becomes available. Future environmental review could result in supplemental EISs, addendums, or Determination(s) of Non-Significance.

MAJOR CONCLUSIONS

Either Alternative 1, No Action, Alternative 2, Modified Plans, or the Preferred Alternative, will result in significant additions of population and employment. As a larger area of Downtown/mixed-use development is assumed for Alternative 2 or the Preferred Alternative, the growth level is relatively higher than Alternative 1, though overall conclusions about growth impacts are similar.

Long-term local impacts resulting from any of the studied Alternatives include increased urbanization, particularly Downtown, cumulative impacts to fish and wildlife habitat, decreased transportation levels of service, increased demand for infrastructure and facilities, an increase in ambient noise levels, and an increase in air pollutant emissions. However, a concentration of growth Downtown enhances the viability of transit, has the potential to reduce single-occupant vehicle travel, is beneficial to regional air quality generally, and depending on location of Downtown growth, could re-utilize land with less environmental constraints than elsewhere. Furthermore, concentrating new growth in the Downtown enables the City to preserve the character of existing single-family neighborhoods.

The primary differences in the Alternatives lie in the focus of policies in the areas of housing, community design, citizen communication, level of surface water management, and park priorities and standards.

SIGNIFICANT AREAS OF CONTROVERSY AND UNCERTAINTY

No areas of controversy were identified through the EIS scoping process. Areas of debate occurred as the Draft Comprehensive Plan/Draft EIS was reviewed (see **Appendix B** of this document). Categories of comment included:

- Requests for site-specific land use map changes or retention of adopted land use map classifications in the Downtown Area, Swamp Creek Area, NE 175th Street, Juanita Drive, and NE 155th Street vicinity

- Concern about the Public and Private Institutions classification
- Requests in support of certain surface water improvement alternatives, or requests to add surface water alternatives
- Concern about traffic levels of service, or specific transportation problems in specific locations (e.g. SR-522 segments)
- Effectiveness of sensitive area regulations and enforcement
- Suggestions for corrections to data and maps.

ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

As the Final Comprehensive Plan/Draft EIS was prepared, the following issues were resolved:

- Selection and refinement of the Citywide land use plan
- Amount and location of Downtown development
- Refinement of goals, objectives, and policies
- Selection of a Transportation level of service standard
- Selection of a Parks level of service standard
- Determination of a Police protection level of service standard
- Completion of a Capital Facilities Element and six-year capital improvement program.

ENVIRONMENTAL SUMMARY

The following matrix table highlights the significant impacts that would potentially result from development under Alternative 1, the No Action Alternative, Alternative 2, Modified Plans, and the Preferred Alternative by environmental topic. Mitigation measures are identified including plan features that act as mitigation, regulations and commitments, and potential modifications to the alternatives. Not all City, state or federal codes and regulations are identified, only the primary ones that pertain to mitigating significant impacts. Significant unavoidable adverse impacts are also identified, as applicable.

Each component and the alternatives are addressed below. In terms of environmental analysis, the information or conclusions apply to the identified proposal component, or where unspecified, the environmental information or conclusions for the Alternative 1, No Action, or Alternative 2, Modified Plans, or the Preferred Alternative apply to their respective components.

ENVIRONMENTAL SUMMARY MATRIX

ENVIRONMENTAL TOPIC	ALTERNATIVE 1 NO ACTION: EXISTING PLANS	ALTERNATIVE 2 MODIFIED PLANS	PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
EARTH			
Impacts	<p><i>General Citywide</i></p> <p>Under any Alternative, development or redevelopment could result in short-term erosion during construction depending on extent of grading, time of year, and effectiveness of erosion control measures. In comparison to Alternative 1, Alternative 2 or the Preferred Alternative would apply greater surface water standards.</p> <p>The risk of earthquake is most severe in the region of Swamp Creek, the Sammamish River basin, and the northern end of Lake Washington north of NE 166th Place where soil conditions could facilitate liquefaction. Under any Alternative, without proper soil preparation and structural design, building failures and possible collapse could occur. Construction of critical facilities, such as fire, police, schools and others in areas of liquefaction can increase the risk of severe problems.</p> <p>The potential for erosion and landslide potential exist in portions of Kenmore with steeper slopes having unstable soils or geologic formations. Erosion problems are exacerbated with land clearing and development. Earthquakes, undermining of a slope by humans or flowing rivers, unusually heavy rains, excessive landscape watering, or focusing of storm runoff can cause erosion or landsliding. These impacts could occur with the implementation of any Alternative.</p> <p><i>Downtown</i></p> <p>Concept A would result in redevelopment in the vicinity of a recognized wetland where soils disturbed during the construction phase of work could, if not properly managed, result in sediments reaching the Class 1 wetland, impacting its functions and values.</p> <p>Under Concept B, redevelopment would occur in previously urbanized areas. Without erosion-controlling measures, earth-moving activities during the construction phase could result in off-site erosion and sedimentation.</p> <p>Concept C would result in earth-moving activities, as described for Concept B, as well as additional areas adjacent to the Sammamish River east of 68th Avenue NE. Redevelopment along the river would occur in a seismic hazard zone.</p>		
Mitigation Measure Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As required under the 1998 <u>King County Surface Water Design Manual</u> (KCSWDM, adopted by the City of Kenmore), any earth-moving activities would require general measures for erosion and sedimentation control, including construction best management practices (BMPs), clearing and grading limits, maintaining building sites during construction, and revegetation of disturbed areas immediately after completion of work. Each development project would be required to have a Temporary Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan (TESCP) prior to clearing and construction. Each project would be required to comply with the City's Municipal Code and Uniform Building Code. Under Downtown Concept A, buffer zones would be established during the construction phase of work to prevent earth-moving activities from disturbing sensitive areas. With Alternatives 2 or the Preferred, the Public/Private Institution designation on parks and open space lands would limit development in areas where clearing and grading could result in erosion and sedimentation. With the Preferred Alternative, the Special Study Area overlay district applied to the St. Thomas Seminary (Bastyr) will require 		

ENVIRONMENTAL TOPIC	ALTERNATIVE 1 NO ACTION: EXISTING PLANS	ALTERNATIVE 2 MODIFIED PLANS	PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
	master planning in consideration of environmental features and long-term goals of institutional and joint public use.		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Policies in the Comprehensive Plan to protect open space and environmentally sensitive areas would prevent disturbances in those areas.		
	Additionally, Comprehensive Plan goals, objectives, and policies would act as mitigation and are identified in the EIS analysis.		
Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts	Unavoidable adverse impacts as a result of future development under any alternative could include some increase in soil loss during construction. Alternative 2 or the Preferred Alternative would provide additional surface water controls (both during construction and after) than currently exist under Alternative 1. To the extent that future regulations [adopted by the City of Kenmore in response to the Endangered Species Act 4(d) rule, or in response to other federal, State, or local laws] would further address erosion control requirements, it may be possible to minimize erosion impacts. Impacts will be more precisely determined at a project-specific level.		
	No Alternative completely restricts development in areas that have the potential for seismic, landslide, or erosion hazards. Even sites that are regulated by the City’s sensitive areas ordinances may be developed to some extent. Development on sites with geologic hazards will always pose some risk, however slight.		
AIR QUALITY			
Impacts	Increased population due to redevelopment would result in additional traffic in the immediate vicinity and an increase in airborne pollutants from vehicles. Alternative 1 would result in an estimated 186,800 total daily vehicle trips.	Increased population due to redevelopment would result in additional traffic in the immediate vicinity and an increase in airborne pollutants from vehicles. Alternative 2 would result in an estimated 193,730 total daily vehicle trips.	Increased population due to redevelopment would result in additional traffic in the immediate vicinity and an increase in airborne pollutants from vehicles. The Preferred Alternative would result in 191,900 total daily vehicle trips.
	Construction activity would have temporary impacts on air quality, including emissions from construction vehicles and increased suspended particulates (dust and smoke) during earth-moving activities and from unfinished roads.	Construction and wood-burning stove impacts would be similar to Alternative 1.	Construction and wood-burning stove impacts would be similar to Alternative 1.
	New residential development could include installation of wood-burning stoves that could impact air quality if used during certain weather conditions.	By concentrating development in the Downtown area, fewer trips to outlying reaches of the City would be generated than with a dispersed pattern. Alternative 2 would provide a more concentrated development pattern with larger areas of mixed-use than Alternative 1, although Alternative 1 does provide some areas for mixed-use development. Policies associated with Alternative 2 also address creation of a local transit circulator route.	The Preferred Alternative has larger mixed-use areas than Alternative 1, but a little less than Alternative 2. Policies associated with the Preferred Alternative also address creation of a local transit circulator route.
	By concentrating development in the Downtown area, fewer trips to outlying reaches of the City would be generated than with a dispersed pattern.	Alternative 2 would eliminate the Industrial classification. The change from Industrial to Commercial uses could reduce point sources of air pollutants over time.	The Preferred Alternative would also eliminate the Industrial classification, which could reduce point sources of air pollutants over time.

ENVIRONMENTAL TOPIC	ALTERNATIVE 1 NO ACTION: EXISTING PLANS	ALTERNATIVE 2 MODIFIED PLANS	PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
Mitigation Measure Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Construction contractors would have to comply with Puget Sound Air Pollution Control Agency (PSAPCA) regulations requiring all reasonable precautions be taken to avoid dust emissions. Construction-related traffic could be scheduled to avoid peak hour traffic.Actions that reduce traffic volumes, increase average travel speeds, or reduce congestion and delay at intersections would tend to reduce emissions and related pollutant concentrations. Please refer to the Transportation section of this EIS for further discussion of traffic-mitigating measures. <p>Additionally, Comprehensive Plan goals, objectives, and policies would act as mitigation and are identified in the EIS analysis.</p>		
Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts	Currently the Puget Sound region is in compliance with federal and state air quality standards. Additional development in the Planning Area, under any Alternative examined in this EIS, will contribute to the regional pollutant burden. Concentrated mixed-use development proposed under any of the Alternatives may be beneficial to countywide and regional air quality. However, there could be localized increases in air pollutant emissions due to traffic increases that would require monitoring and mitigation where appropriate.		
SURFACE WATER			
Impacts	<p><i>General Citywide</i></p> <p>Construction-phase earth moving would expose underlying soils and could result in sediments being transported to local waterways.</p> <p>Additional urbanization, particularly the increase in impervious surfaces, could have adverse effects on streams and receiving waters; these include increases in flooding, stream bank erosion, and pollutant transport.</p> <p>Stormwater runoff from urbanized areas, especially roads and parking lots, will carry heavy metals and petroleum hydrocarbons as well as pesticides and nutrients from landscaping and pet waste to nearby waterways.</p> <p>Increased residential population and local employment associated with any Alternative will result in more vehicle miles traveled on city streets, increasing automobile-related nonpoint source water pollutants.</p>	<p><i>General Citywide</i></p> <p>Sedimentation and surface water runoff impacts would be similar to Alternative 1. Alternative 2 includes the Draft Surface Water Management Plan, which, in comparison to Alternative 1, recommends increased surface water requirements for new development (both during and after construction) and redevelopment, water quality facility retrofitting of roads, an illicit discharge detection and elimination program, and public education programs for property and business owners in existing developed areas to reduce non-point pollution, including the control of erosion from everyday human activities.</p> <p>Increased residential population and local employment associated with any Alternative will result in more vehicle miles traveled on city streets, increasing automobile-related nonpoint source water pollutants. In comparison to Alternative 1, Alternative 2 could result in a higher population and employment level and associated vehicle miles traveled. As described above, Alternative 2 includes the</p>	<p><i>General Citywide</i></p> <p>Sedimentation and surface water runoff impacts would be similar to Alternative 1. The Preferred Alternative includes the Final Surface Water Management Plan, 2001 with similar benefits as Alternative 2.</p> <p>Increased residential population and local employment associated with any Alternative will result in more vehicle miles traveled on city streets, increasing automobile-related nonpoint source water pollutants. The Preferred Alternative results in population and employment levels and associated vehicle miles traveled within the range of Alternatives 1 and 2. Water quality retrofitting solutions for certain roads are included in the Final Surface Water Management Plan, 2001.</p> <p><i>Downtown</i></p> <p>Downtown impacts are similar to Alternative 1.</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL TOPIC	ALTERNATIVE 1 NO ACTION: EXISTING PLANS	ALTERNATIVE 2 MODIFIED PLANS	PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
	<p><i>Downtown</i></p> <p>Redevelopment under Concept A would occur primarily in a small portion of the Swamp Creek drainage basin, adjacent to a delineated wetland.</p> <p>Redevelopment under Concept B would primarily occur west of 68th Avenue NE in the North Lake Washington drainage basin where surface water runoff currently drains to Lake Washington through a piped conveyance system lacking water quality improvement facilities.</p> <p>Under Concept C redevelopment would occur within the Sammamish River basin, a portion of which is within the 100-year floodplain. For a more detailed discussion of flooding impacts Citywide and Downtown, refer to the Stormwater analysis later in this section.</p> <p>Under Concepts B and C, reduction of exposed surface parking would reduce nonpoint source pollution as well as elevated temperatures of street/parking lot runoff draining to Swamp Creek, the Sammamish River, and Lake Washington.</p>	<p>Draft Surface Water Management Plan, and would recommend water quality facility retrofitting on certain roads whereas Alternative 1 would continue current surface water regulations.</p> <p><i>Downtown</i></p> <p>Downtown impacts are similar to Alternative 1.</p>	
Mitigation Measure Summary	<p><i>General Citywide/Downtown</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Under all alternatives, new development and redevelopment would have to meet both core and special requirements in the 1998 KCSWDM before receiving building permits. Any surface water management projects would be subject to requirements listed in the KCSWDM and each would be subject to review by a number of regulatory agencies. The City of Kenmore has developed a Final Surface Water Management Plan, 2001 to address drainage issues. (Please refer to the Stormwater Section, below.) Solutions for water quality and quantity problems are included in the plan. The Washington State Department of Ecology requires a Shoreline Master Program substantial development permit for significant development adjacent to waterways. Until Kenmore prepares its own Shoreline Master Program, Kenmore will continue to apply <u>King County Shoreline Master Program</u> guidelines for new construction projects adjacent to waterways. The existing King County Sensitive Areas Ordinance, adopted by the City of Kenmore, requires buffers adjacent to wetlands and waterways. The National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) will publish a Stormwater Management Checklist in 2001 that will be consistent with elements required under the Phase II National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES), the <u>Puget Sound Water</u> 		

ENVIRONMENTAL TOPIC	ALTERNATIVE 1 NO ACTION: EXISTING PLANS	ALTERNATIVE 2 MODIFIED PLANS	PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
	<u>Quality Management Plan</u> (PSWQMP), and the Growth Management Act (GMA). The collective goal of these regulations is the protection of water resources. (Please see Stormwater , below.)		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Extension of sewer lines to serve all residences should improve water quality in receiving waterways.		
	Additionally, Comprehensive Plan goals, objectives, and policies would act as mitigation and are identified in the EIS analysis.		
Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts	Increases in resident population and employment will increase the number of vehicle miles traveled on city streets, leading to higher levels of vehicle-related pollutants reaching natural waterways. Other sources of diffuse water pollution will result from increased levels of human activity, such as pet waste and poor gardening practices. Alternatives 1, 2, or the Preferred Alternative include surface water regulations, although Alternative 2 or the Preferred Alternative would strengthen these regulations and recommend retrofitting existing road facilities with water quality treatment. To the extent that future regulations [adopted by the City of Kenmore in response to the Endangered Species Act 4(d) rule, or in response to other federal, State, or local laws] would address water quality requirements, it may be possible to further minimize surface water impacts. The level of significance of surface water impacts would be more precisely determined through project-specific environmental review.		
FISH AND WILDLIFE			
Impacts	<p><i>General Citywide</i></p> <p>Development of parcels in residential zones could occur on or in the vicinity of wetlands or riparian areas. Habitat could be impacted if vegetation were removed and hydrology altered. The City’s policies would still require no-net-loss of wetland functions.</p> <p>Transportation improvements similar to those proposed with Alternative 2 have been modeled for Alternative 1. Wetland and fish and wildlife impacts could be similar to either Alternative 2 or the Preferred Alternative if the transportation improvements were adopted along with Alternative 1.</p> <p>Additional growth would be generated in the City that would result in increased traffic and human activity. An increased number of vehicles in the Study Area would result in additional nonpoint source pollution entering waterways, impacting fish and wildlife habitat.</p>	<p><i>General Citywide</i></p> <p>Potential impacts to wetlands or riparian areas as a result of residential development, or as a result of nonpoint source pollution from increased traffic and human activity, or as a result of increased impervious surfaces leading to changes to flows of receiving waters would be similar to Alternative 1.</p> <p>Alternative 2 proposes transportation capital improvements that could affect wetlands and fish and wildlife habitat (e.g., stream crossings) including, but not limited to, the extension of NE 145th Street, NE 83rd Place if extended over the Sammamish River, bridge widening on SR-522 just west of 80th Avenue NE, and expansion of 61st Avenue NE.</p> <p>For Alternative 2, the Public/Private Institution designation would help limit development in areas where clearing and grading could result in degradation to habitat areas, such as in the area of Bastyr University.</p>	<p><i>General Citywide</i></p> <p>Potential impacts to wetlands or riparian areas as a result of residential development, or as a result of nonpoint source pollution from increased traffic and human activity, or as a result of increased impervious surfaces leading to changes to flows of receiving waters would be similar to Alternative 1.</p> <p>Impacts associated with transportation capital improvements would be similar to Alternative 2 in most respects. However, the Preferred Alternative would have less impacts than Alternative 2 by eliminating the NE 83rd Place extension over the Sammamish River as a potential improvement.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative includes the Public/Private Institution designation with similar outcomes as Alternative 2. The Special Study Area applied to the St. Thomas Seminary (Bastyr) will require master planning in consideration of environmental features and long-term goals of institutional and joint public use.</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL TOPIC	ALTERNATIVE 1 NO ACTION: EXISTING PLANS	ALTERNATIVE 2 MODIFIED PLANS	PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
	<p>Additional urbanization could have adverse effects on streams and receiving waters; these include increases in flooding, streambank erosion, and pollutant transport. Reduced infiltration from increased impervious surfaces would reduce the water available to provide base flows in the receiving waters, and previously perennial streams can become seasonally dry. Sediment eroded from the streambanks can impact fish habitat and aquatic insects (a major food resource for fish).</p> <p><i>Downtown</i></p> <p>Concept A, would focus more redevelopment in the vicinity of the heron rookery and wetland. Short-term construction impacts, and long-term impacts such as additional noise, human activity, and lighting could occur adjacent to the wetland.</p> <p>No adverse impacts to habitat would be anticipated under Concept B.</p> <p>Redevelopment proposed under Concept C would create additional traffic and activity south of SR-522 and in the vicinity of the Sammamish River east of 68th Avenue NE. Short-term construction impacts, and long-term impacts including additional traffic, the presence of pets, and night lighting could impact habitat in the riparian corridor.</p> <p><i>Surface Water Management</i></p> <p>Alternative 1 would continue current surface water regulations, and existing water quality and water quantity problems would continue.</p>	<p>In comparison to Alternative 1, which continues current standards, Alternative 2 would include the Draft Surface Water Management Plan, which recommends a series of additional regulatory and enhancement proposals, particularly relevant to fish habitat.</p> <p><i>Downtown</i></p> <p>Impacts to fish and wildlife as a result of Downtown development would be similar to those identified for Alternative 1.</p> <p><i>Park Concept Plans</i></p> <p>Alternative 2 includes potential park improvements to five Kenmore parks. Suggested improvements are advisory. More specific environmental analysis will occur as the Citywide Park Master Plan is prepared as well as at the project-specific level.</p> <p>Kenmore Park: During the construction phase, fish and wildlife habitat could be impacted if vegetation important to habitat were removed and hydrology altered. Erosion and consequent sedimentation could occur during the wet-weather season if not properly controlled. Additional trails could increase human activity in fish and wildlife habitat areas.</p> <p>Linwood Park: Potential impacts to the onsite stream and other habitat could be similar to those identified for Kenmore Park.</p> <p>Logboom (Tracey Owen) Park: Construction impacts and increased human activity along shoreline trails could occur as described for Kenmore Park. Dock improvements and any in-water or near-shore work could impact aquatic habitat</p>	<p>The Final Surface Water Management Plan, 2001 would have similar enhancement proposals as Alternative 2.</p> <p><i>Downtown</i></p> <p>Impacts to fish and wildlife as a result of Downtown development would be similar to those identified for Alternative 1.</p> <p><i>Park Concept Plans</i></p> <p>Potential park improvement impacts would be the same as for Alternative 2.</p> <p><i>Final Surface Water Management Plan</i></p> <p>Potential impacts associated with the installation of surface water improvements would be similar to Alternative 2.</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL TOPIC	ALTERNATIVE 1 NO ACTION: EXISTING PLANS	ALTERNATIVE 2 MODIFIED PLANS	PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
		<p>and aquatic life in Lake Washington.</p> <p>Wallace-Swamp Creek Park: Potential impacts to Swamp Creek and associated wetlands related to construction and use of improvements would be similar to those described for Kenmore Park.</p> <p><i>Draft Surface Water Management Plan</i></p> <p>The following impacts are associated with the Draft Surface Water Management Plan that is proposed with Alternative 2:</p> <p>Installation of surface water quantity and quality control facilities improvements could result in erosion and consequent sedimentation of receiving waters, if not properly controlled.</p> <p>A wetpond or bioswales could be installed in Logboom Park potentially near wetlands; without mitigation, construction near wetlands could have impacts.</p> <p>Construction of open wetponds in Swamp Creek Park, Kenmore Park, and the vicinity of NE 175th Street/Sammamish River could impact fish and wildlife habitat if not properly executed.</p> <p>At the Harbour Village area, construction of ponds and annual cleaning to address sedimentation could affect tributary 0056. If stream flows are effectively bypassed during construction and annual cleaning, impacts should be minimized.</p>	
Mitigation Measure Summary	<p><i>General Citywide/Park Concept Plans/Surface Water Management Plan</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • King County's Sensitive Areas Ordinance has been adopted by the City of Kenmore and would require appropriate buffers and setbacks from recognized sensitive features. • Federal and State regulations apply to endangered species and certain key wetlands. • Development activities in the vicinity of Lake Washington, Sammamish River, and Swamp Creek would require Shoreline Master Program permits. 		

ENVIRONMENTAL TOPIC	ALTERNATIVE 1 NO ACTION: EXISTING PLANS	ALTERNATIVE 2 MODIFIED PLANS	PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">For Alternative 2, the Public/Private Institution designation would help limit development in areas where clearing and grading could result in degradation to habitat areas, such as in the area of Bastyr University. The Preferred Alternative also includes the Public/Private Institution designation with similar benefits to Alternative 2. The Special Study Area District applied to the St. Thomas Seminary (Bastyr) will require master planning in consideration of environmental features and long-term goals of institutional and joint public use. <p><i>Downtown</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">By concentrating development in the Downtown sector (Concepts B and C), extensive earth-moving activities would be confined to that area.Redevelopment under Concept C in the vicinity of the Sammamish River would require Shoreline Master Program permits. <p>Additionally, Comprehensive Plan goals, objectives, and policies would act as mitigation and are identified in the EIS analysis.</p>		
Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts	<p>Under Alternative 1, or Alternative 2, or the Preferred Alternative, increased urbanization of the City's watersheds could further impact wildlife habitat either directly or indirectly. Direct impacts to fish and wildlife could be avoided or mitigated depending upon development levels and design of residential, commercial, and public uses and infrastructure improvements. Indirect cumulative impacts associated with changes to habitat quality from non-point source pollution could be partially reduced by surface water management regulations, in particular, with the additional regulations, improvements, and education programs included with the Draft Surface Water Management Plan associated with Alternative 2 and included with the Final Surface Water Management Plan, 2001 associated with the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>To the extent that future sensitive area and surface water regulations are amended or adopted [in response to the Endangered Species Act 4(d) rule, or in response to other federal, State, or local laws] it may be possible to further minimize indirect impacts to fish and wildlife. The level of significance of fish and wildlife impacts would be more precisely determined through project-specific environmental review.</p>		
LAND USE			
Impacts	<p>Implementation of either Alternative 1, No Action, or Alternative 2, Modified Plans, or the Preferred Alternative could result in displacement of existing development where the zoning classification applies a different use category than the current development. Alternative 2 or the Preferred Alternative would displace more industrial uses than Alternative 1, primarily due to the reclassification of Industrially zoned properties to Regional Business.</p> <p>Under any of the Alternatives, conflicts may arise (e.g. hours of operation, traffic, pollutants, trespassing, privacy) where the Downtown development areas abut single-family areas, or where multi-family, commercial or mixed-use development abuts single-family uses, or where commercial uses abut multi-family. Conflicts may also occur due to different scales of development, such as areas abutting the Downtown. Conflicts areas are located east and west of 68th Avenue NE, north of Bothell Way, and along NE 175th Street.</p> <p>The Alternatives allow development of different land uses that generate different patterns of activity. The Alternatives will generate additional single-family residential, multi-family residential, commercial, and office uses. New uses will occur on vacant and partially developed land. Redevelopment would occur in the Downtown area primarily. Alternative 2 would generate a relatively higher percent increase in multi-family, commercial, and office uses as it assumes larger area devoted to mixed-use Downtown redevelopment.</p> <p>For any Alternative, some property owners may seek rezones of less intensively zoned areas due to nearby more intensively zoned areas, or due to perceptions that the properties are similarly situated in terms of development potential, or environmental constraints. Areas that</p>		

ENVIRONMENTAL TOPIC	ALTERNATIVE 1 NO ACTION: EXISTING PLANS	ALTERNATIVE 2 MODIFIED PLANS	PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
	may particularly be subject to rezone requests are areas immediately adjacent to the proposed Downtown concept areas.		
Mitigation Measure Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Zoning Code and other development regulations provide for compatibility between adjacent differing uses through setbacks, height restrictions, and landscaping requirements. Additionally, Comprehensive Plan goals, objectives, and policies would act as mitigation and are identified in the EIS analysis.		
Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts	Over time, the implementation of the Alternatives could irreversibly commit vacant, partially developed, and redeveloped properties to additional or new single-family, multi-family, commercial, and office uses. The implementation of any Alternative could irreversibly displace industrial uses for commercial or mixed-use developments. Reductions in industrial uses could be greater for Alternative 2 or the Preferred Alternative than for Alternative 1.		
LAND USE PLANS			
Impacts	<p>Any of the Alternatives would meet GMA goals, although there are variations in some approaches. Alternative 2 or the Preferred Alternative would emphasize protection of single-family areas more than Alternative 1; however, there would still be opportunities for mixed-use and multi-family development in central Kenmore and along major arterials. Alternative 2 or the Preferred Alternative would also emphasize greater communication with citizens, businesses, and property owners regarding the City’s development of programs, policies, regulations, and permit process management.</p> <p>All Alternatives designate Kenmore as an Activity Center where mixed-use development and transit improvements will occur consistent with <u>Vision 2020</u>.</p> <p>With the exception of the minimum housing density policy that is to apply to all residential zones, Alternative 2 or the Preferred Alternative meet the <u>King County Countywide Planning Policies</u>. Alternative 2 or the Preferred Alternative would require minimum densities in zones with 12 or more units per acre. Other Alternative 2 or Preferred Alternative policies require an average zoning density of 7 dwelling units per acre, meeting housing targets, meeting affordable housing targets, and require annual monitoring of the plan. These policies should result in sufficient densities being achieved in zones with less than 12 units per acre. Alternative 1 includes a policy requiring minimum densities in all residential zones. However, there is a conflict between Alternative 1 policies and the City’s Interim Zoning Code which does not apply minimum density requirements in the R-4, R-6 and R-8 zones.</p> <p>Overall, with any Alternative, there is compatibility with adjacent jurisdiction plans in terms of land use.</p> <p>In terms of transportation for any Alternative, there are some differences in Level of Service (LOS) standards with Bothell, and the State of Washington regarding NE Bothell Way (SR-522). Differences in LOS for NE Bothell Way will likely be resolved when the State finalizes LOS standards for Highways of Statewide Significance, anticipated in 2001. Alternative 2 or the Preferred Alternative also proposes a different classification for NE 145th Street (Collector) whereas King County classifies it as a local road.</p> <p>For either Alternative 1 or 2, or the Preferred there are LOS and functional classification differences between Kenmore and Lake Forest Park regarding 55th Avenue NE. There are also differences for either Alternative regarding the functional classification system between Kenmore and Snohomish County. Joint discussions between Kenmore and adjacent jurisdictions with appropriate plan amendments could resolve discrepancies.</p> <p>Utility District water and sewer plans include population estimate that are lower than the population estimates prepared for the Alternatives in this Final Comprehensive Plan. If Kenmore’s household size were reduced to be equivalent to the District’s projected household size, Kenmore’s Comprehensive Plan population statistics would be more consistent with the Utility District’s plans for Kenmore.</p>		

ENVIRONMENTAL TOPIC	ALTERNATIVE 1 NO ACTION: EXISTING PLANS	ALTERNATIVE 2 MODIFIED PLANS	PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
All Alternatives address tenets of the Vision Statement, with Alternative 2 or the Preferred Alternative having policies which emphasize or are more consistent with Vision Statement items addressing Kenmore’s small town feeling, community pride, concentration of multi-family in Downtown, design review, local transportation options, and citizen participation.			
Mitigation Measure Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none">For Alternative 1, the Zoning Code could be amended to require minimum densities in all residential zones. Another option would be that the City could petition the Growth Management Planning Council to amend the policy requiring minimum densities in favor of an approach that lets jurisdictions determine how to provide for urban densities in their cities.Alternative 2 or the Preferred Alternative could be amended to promote minimum densities in all residential zones or to provide stronger statements about monitoring of minimum densities in zones having less than 12 units per acre. Another option would be that the City could petition the Growth Management Planning Council to amend the policy requiring minimum densities in favor of an approach that lets jurisdictions determine how to provide for urban densities in their cities.The City could work with adjacent jurisdictions and WSDOT to determine compatible functional classifications and levels of service for roadways.Objectives 2.7, 48.1 and their associated policies address joint planning, and coordination with the Northshore Utility District including development projections.		
Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts	No unavoidable adverse impacts are anticipated. If plan conflicts are not resolved at the plan adoption stage or through future plan amendments, there would be significant adverse impacts in terms of Land Use Plan consistency.		
AESTHETICS/LIGHT AND GLARE			
Impacts	<p>General Citywide</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Views from residential neighborhoods at higher elevations to the Downtown core may change, depending on future building heights and scale. Building height and bulk in Downtown and along NE Bothell Way, as well as the planting of street trees, could impact some views to Lake Washington at lower elevations. The level of impact may vary depending on topography, building location and design, architectural treatments, landscaping, etc. The potential for aesthetic impacts is a topic that should be addressed in phased environmental review as development regulations are adopted or specific projects are reviewed.The pedestrian bridge to be built as part of the LakePointe development would have a visual impact along the SR-522 corridor through Kenmore.All Alternatives concentrate development Downtown, and, thus, preserve the existing character of local single-family neighborhoods. Alternative 2 or the Preferred Alternative include policies that would further protect single-family neighborhoods by making single-family dwellings the primary use and restricting the use of access tracts. <p>Downtown</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Concept A would continue the existing pattern of development in the Downtown center. Development would occur primarily through the private sector, and single-use buildings would be standard. Signage patterns would continue. Surface parking would remain the norm.Concept B would focus on a "mixed-use" zone as redevelopment west of 68th Avenue NE between SR-522 and NE 182nd Street. Mixed-use buildings would encourage residential units above or adjacent to commercial/business offices, leading to greater visual		

ENVIRONMENTAL TOPIC	ALTERNATIVE 1 NO ACTION: EXISTING PLANS	ALTERNATIVE 2 MODIFIED PLANS	PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
	<p>variety of architecture. Changes to commercial development along SR-522 could occur between 65th and 68th Avenues NE. Depending on building materials and lighting fixtures, impacts from light/glare may occur for drivers and surrounding residential areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concept C would shift the core area away from north side of SR-522 west of 68th Avenue NE and would call for new mixed-use zoning. New street patterns and development would provide opportunities for visual improvements. Public uses and civic center would take advantage of water views. Additional lighting would be introduced to the area and would be visible at night from residential areas on the south side of the Sammamish River. Glare from sunlight reflected off new development along the river could impact residential areas on the south side of the River. • To comply with Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Element policies, view corridors should be identified and protected. Potential view corridor locations are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Existing areas along SR-522, from 68th Avenue NE to 61st Ave. NE, along Burke-Gilman Trail just west of Log Boom Park to 68th Avenue NE – View of bay by the cement plant, and the future LakePointe development from the northwest corner of the SR-522/ 68th Avenue NE intersection – From internal roads and side paths of the future LakePointe project (if developed) – From trail connections along the Sammamish River – From internal streets of new development areas east of 68th Avenue NE and south of the new Kenmore Loop Road/NE 175th Street if they occur – From Kenmore Park, and portions of NE 175th Street near the sewage pump station – From the road frontage of Swamp Creek Park on 175th Street NE if vegetation is thinned out to create views – From 68th Avenue NE bridge. 		
Mitigation Measure Summary	<p><i>General Citywide</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All Alternatives propose the addition of street trees and sidewalks. • All Alternatives propose pedestrian walkways along urban trails and along the Sammamish River. • Alternatives 1, 2, and the Preferred Alternative concentrate development Downtown and thus preserve the existing character of local neighborhoods. Alternative 2 or the Preferred Alternative include policies that would further protect single-family neighborhoods by making single-family dwellings the primary use and restricting the use of access tracts. <p><i>Downtown</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under Concepts B and C, structured parking would reduce surface parking. • Under Concept C, the redevelopment south of SR-522 and east of 68th Avenue NE would be designed as a master planned development and as such would have greater visual cohesion than currently exists in the commercial center. • Under Concept C, buildings of the city center along the Sammamish River could be required to use non-reflecting finishes and low-reflective glass. Street lighting could be designed to minimize impacts to off-site properties. Trees planted along the river would 		

ENVIRONMENTAL TOPIC	ALTERNATIVE 1 NO ACTION: EXISTING PLANS	ALTERNATIVE 2 MODIFIED PLANS	PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
	<div>shield some of the off-site lighting impacts.</div> <div><ul style="list-style-type: none">Existing and potential view corridors should be preserved, maintained and improved where possible. Strategies for creating the visual access include the retention of existing views on public properties, and by regulation of design and through placing restrictions on private development:<ul style="list-style-type: none">Retain existing views currently in areas of public ownership, such as on City-owned lands. View corridors and pedestrian linkages can be used to form a skeleton of open spaces surrounded by buildings of future development plans for those areas.Retain view corridors in existing road rights of way, recreational areas and regional trail corridors such as Log Boom Park, Kenmore Park, the Burke Gilman Trail, SR-522, and along 68th Avenue NE, by requiring adjacent new developments to provide visual access.Create potential for view corridors in master planned areas by requiring them in the design and permitting of private property development proposals.Direct future Downtown master plans through design and development regulations such as design guidelines to exploit potential water views. These regulatory devices would address massing of buildings, building heights, setbacks, and scale of the built and pedestrian environment.Address potential interference in visual access such as the NE 175th Street pedestrian bridge connection to SR-522 by LakePointe. Bridge structures and design can be light and transparent in construction so as not to dominate the view lines to Lake Washington when viewed from properties north of SR-522.</div> <div>Additionally, Comprehensive Plan goals, objectives, and policies would act as mitigation and are identified in the EIS analysis.</div>		
Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts	No significant unavoidable adverse aesthetic impacts are anticipated.		
HISTORIC/CULTURAL RESOURCES			
Impacts	<div><ul style="list-style-type: none">Under either Alternative, additional traffic could result in capital improvements to the Kenmore Bridge over the Sammamish River. However, this structure is ineligible for Landmark Status because of alterations made over time.Under any Alternative, the Kenmore Community Club would be zoned for commercial or industrial uses, and the structure could be demolished or converted to another use. However, currently, the structure is not considered eligible for landmark status.Under Alternative 1, public and private educational and governmental institutions are designated with residential classifications, which could possibly mean that the sites could be surplus and sold for residential uses. Where properties have governmental ownerships this is less likely, than where there are private institutional ownerships, such as the Bastyr University area. Additional development in the proximity of the St. Edward Seminary could impact the landmark. Under the Public/Private Institution Designation proposed with Alternative 2, master plans for educational or governmental developments would help minimize impacts in the St. Edward State Park area. With the Preferred Alternative, the Special Study Area overlay district applied to the St. Thomas Seminary (Bastyr) will require master planning in consideration of environmental features and long-term goals of institutional and joint public use.None of the Alternatives studied would propose substantive new development in proximity to the County designated historic</div>		

ENVIRONMENTAL TOPIC	ALTERNATIVE 1 NO ACTION: EXISTING PLANS	ALTERNATIVE 2 MODIFIED PLANS	PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
Mitigation Measure Summary	landmark, the Thomsen Estate. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The City could develop an historic structure ordinance and other programs to promote historic and cultural education and recognition. 		
Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts	Additionally, Comprehensive Plan goals, objectives, and policies would act as mitigation and are identified in the EIS analysis. No significant unavoidable adverse historic or cultural resources impacts are anticipated with implementation of either Alternative 1, No Action, or Alternative 2, Modified Plans, or the Preferred Alternative.		
HOUSING			
Impacts	<p>There would be an increase in both single-family and multi-family dwellings as a result of implementing either Alternative 1, No Action, or 2, Modified Plans, or the Preferred Alternative. Under any Alternative, new multi-family dwelling units would be added primarily in central Kenmore as part of the redevelopment of commercial areas to mixed-use developments. It is assumed that these units would be attached townhouses or flats. With a larger Downtown redevelopment area, Alternative 2 would add more attached dwellings than Alternative 1 or the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Under Alternative 1, more single-family units would be provided at the location of Bastyr University where the land is zoned for single-family residential units. Additional dormitory units are also possible. Under Alternative 2, the Public/Private Institution classification would prevent single-family dwelling units. With the Preferred Alternative, the Special Study Area overlay district applied to the St. Thomas Seminary (Bastyr) will require master planning in consideration of environmental features and long-term goals of institutional and joint public use. However, it is anticipated that dormitory rooms could be added under Alternative 2 or the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Overall, single-family dwellings will continue to dominate Kenmore in terms of the amount of land devoted to single-family versus multi-family dwellings with Alternative 1 having a little higher percent of single-family than Alternative 2.</p> <p>Alternative 1 would potentially affect the character of single-family neighborhoods by promoting scattered-site multi-family developments. Alternative 2 or the Preferred Alternative would concentrate multi-family uses primarily in the Downtown. Unlike Alternative 1, multi-family and townhouse development would not be options in single-family areas with Alternative 2 or the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Alternative 1 applies multi-family designations to mobile home parks, which may result in their conversion over time as land values increase. However, the policies would support mobile home retention.</p> <p>Alternative 2 or the Preferred Alternative also apply multi-family designations to mobile home parks, which may result in their conversion over time as land values increase. In Alternative 2, Downtown Concept C would allow for mixed-use development in an area with mobile home parks (RB and R-24). The Preferred Alternative reclassifies the mobile home parks on NE 175th near Concept C to be R-24 instead of R-12, the existing classification. However, due to soil conditions and other environmental constraints, there may be pressure for higher density uses in the area southeast of Bothell Way to allow for clustering and to make economical building construction types that account for difficult soil conditions. Whether mobile home parks are located in the Downtown or not, housing policies would allow retention of mobile home parks, but recognize that most of the units in the mobile home parks could become obsolete, and that relocation assistance should be provided, including monetary assistance and preferential location in nearby affordable dwelling units.</p> <p>Any of the Alternatives would provide enough zoned capacity, and a more than sufficient market cushion, to exceed the 2012 household target contained in the Countywide Planning Policies.</p>		

ENVIRONMENTAL TOPIC	ALTERNATIVE 1 NO ACTION: EXISTING PLANS	ALTERNATIVE 2 MODIFIED PLANS	PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
	Generally, to help meet affordable housing needs, both Alternatives support a range of housing programs, including support of Federal, State and Regional housing assistance programs. Alternative 2 or the Preferred Alternative policies are more tailored to the City of Kenmore.		
Mitigation Measure Summary	Comprehensive Plan goals, objectives, and policies would act as mitigation and are identified in the EIS analysis.		
Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts	No significant unavoidable adverse housing are anticipated. See Land Use Plans regarding policy conflicts.		
TRANSPORTATION			
Impacts	<p>There are multi-million dollar new construction projects proposed as part of the Transportation Element. Construction will result in increased noise, dust and glare, as well as delays in the normal flow of traffic. In addition, roadway expansion projects will result in an increase in impervious surface.</p> <p>Improvements to Juanita Drive N., 61st Avenue NE, and 80th Avenue NE may result in the need for additional right-of-way (ROW) along each corridor, which will be determined in the design phase. The extension of NE 141st Street will result in a need for ROW acquisition. The potential extension of 83rd Place NE to NE 170th may result in both acquisition and relocation, but this is not applicable to the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>The long-term improvements to SR-522 will result in the elimination of left turns to and from adjacent properties in many cases. In addition, left turns will be eliminated to and from 68th Avenue NE at NE 175th Street.</p> <p>Level of Service changes are shown in Table ENV-M of the Concise Analysis of Alternatives. Transportation levels of service or delays will degrade at several intersections, primarily on SR-522. Under any alternative, the Level of Service along SR-522 remains at “F”. However, the length of delay varies from intersection to intersection, with somewhat greater delays experienced as a result of Land Use Alternative 2. With the Final Network recommended improvements in place, the Level of Service generally improves over the network, although not at all locations. With the Preferred Alternative and the Final Network, recommended levels of service would be met.</p>		
Mitigation Measure Summary	<p><i>Citywide/Downtown</i></p> <p>A variety of transportation options will be utilized to mitigate impacts of the proposed land use alternatives in the Comprehensive Plan, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Construction of transportation projects as listed in the Transportation Element.• Acquisition and relocation of properties in accordance with local, state and federal standards.• Construction of a median along SR-522, but with simultaneous construction of U-Turn facilities on SR-522 to improve property access.• Construction of a dedicated right-turn lane on 68th Avenue NE, southbound between NE 175th Street and LakePointe Way to improve property access to and from properties on NE 175th Street, west of 68th Avenue NE.• Completion of the “Downtown Loop” to improve local circulation and access to properties along the current NE 175th Street, east of 68th Avenue NE.• Implementation of a financing program that includes a revised transportation impact fee system and appropriate SEPA mitigation		

ENVIRONMENTAL TOPIC	ALTERNATIVE 1 NO ACTION: EXISTING PLANS	ALTERNATIVE 2 MODIFIED PLANS	PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
	for specific improvements not covered in the impact fee system (with the intent that development “pays its own way”).		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Construction of a sidewalk system throughout the community, but as prioritized in accordance with the Transportation Element.• Implementation of appropriate design standards that deal with the loss of pervious surface resulting from construction of new roadways.		
	Additionally, Comprehensive Plan goals, objectives, and policies would act as mitigation and are identified in the EIS analysis.		
Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts	There would be an increase in traffic on all roads discussed in this section with more traffic associated with Alternative 2 than the Preferred Alternative or Alternative 1. To the extent feasible, mitigation measures (road improvements and demand management strategies) have been included to improve future levels of service or maintain a similar amount of delay during the PM peak hour. It is likely that future levels of service on NE Bothell Way (SR-522) will continue to be at LOS F. However, concurrency requirements would not apply to NE Bothell Way, a Highway of Statewide Significance, per the Growth Management Act.		
NOISE			
Impacts	<p>Increased population due to additional development or redevelopment would result in additional traffic in the immediate vicinity and an increase in noise levels from vehicles. Redevelopment under Alternative 1 would result in an estimated 186,800 daily trips that would impact local noise levels. Roadway traffic noise is exempt in State, County, and City noise ordinances.</p> <p>Noise increases on SR-522 would exacerbate current conditions which do not currently meet U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) noise standards. If federally funded housing were proposed for SR-522, it would not meet HUD noise standards as a residential receiver, either currently or in the future.</p> <p>As development occurs, short-term noise impacts could result from construction activity and equipment.</p> <p>Additional growth in seaplane activity at the Air Harbor could increase local noise impacts to nearby residents, or if additional residential development occurs near the Air</p>	<p>Alternative 2 would result in greater level of development, generating an estimated 193,730 daily trips that would impact local noise levels due to automobiles.</p> <p>Impacts associated with increased noise on SR-522 would be similar to Alternative 1.</p> <p>Short-term noise impacts, and seaplane noise impacts would be similar to Alternative 1.</p> <p>Alternative 2 would eliminate the Industrial classification, and existing or future noise from industrial uses would decrease over time.</p>	<p>The Preferred Alternative would result in greater level of development, generating an estimated 191,900 daily trips, in between the range of Alternatives 1 and 2, that would impact local noise levels due to automobiles.</p> <p>Impacts associated with increased noise on SR-522 would be similar to Alternative 1.</p> <p>Short-term noise impacts, and seaplane noise impacts would be similar to Alternative 1.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative would also eliminate the Industrial classification, and existing or future noise from industrial uses would decrease over time.</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL TOPIC	ALTERNATIVE 1 NO ACTION: EXISTING PLANS	ALTERNATIVE 2 MODIFIED PLANS	PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
	Harbor, additional persons could be exposed to seaplane noise.		
Mitigation Measure Summary	Comprehensive Plan goals, objectives, and policies would act as mitigation and are identified in the EIS analysis.		
Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts	Noise levels will increase in the Planning Area from short-term and long-term noise sources. Short-term noise sources such as construction and seaplane taxiing noise levels are addressed through adopted noise ordinances. Long-term noise level increases from traffic could increase on major roadways in Kenmore, and generally is exempt from regulations. New residential development could be designed and constructed to minimize interior noise levels. However, increased exterior noise levels from increased traffic would be more difficult to mitigate.		
UTILITIES			
Impacts	<p>Additional population and employment growth will result in additional demand placed upon energy, telecommunication, and cable service facilities. Private utilities have created electronic modeling and growth plans to accommodate future load growth.</p> <p>Additional growth will require the installation of new electric, gas, telecommunication, and cable facilities within public rights-of-way, or within privately held utility corridors. The addition of these facilities could result in visual impacts at the locations where they are installed.</p> <p>Studies of the health effects of electromagnetic fields caused from electrical lines and appliances is currently inconclusive, and as a result, no specific policies about siting of facilities or right-of-way standards have been implemented. Puget Sound Energy (PSE) makes efforts in the planning of facilities to avoid persons as much as possible, in part due to aesthetic considerations.</p>	Alternative 2 would generate additional population and employment growth and would place a higher demand on the services than Alternative 1. Impacts of utility installation and health effects are similar to Alternative 1.	<p>Under the Preferred Alternative, the population is expected to equal 35,119 in the Planning Area which is in between the range of Alternatives 1 and 2.</p> <p>Impacts of utility installation and health effects are similar to Alternative 1.</p>
Mitigation Measure Summary	Comprehensive Plan goals, objectives, and policies would act as mitigation and are identified in the EIS analysis.		
Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts	No significant unavoidable adverse utility impacts are anticipated with implementation of either Alternative 1, No Action, or Alternative 2, Modified Plans, or the Preferred Alternative.		

ENVIRONMENTAL TOPIC	ALTERNATIVE 1 NO ACTION: EXISTING PLANS	ALTERNATIVE 2 MODIFIED PLANS	PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
CITY FACILITIES			
Impacts	To maintain the January 2001 city staffing level of 0.77 regular City employees per thousand population, there would need to be about 26 city staff members, a 100 percent increase over the 13-employee level, and a 86 percent increase in employees over the total 14 employees budgeted for the year 2001. To accommodate 26 staff members at 286 square feet per person, the City hall space would need to equal approximately 7,440 square feet. On a per capita basis, this is 0.245 per capita assuming City residents and 0.218 per capita assuming full Planning Area residents.	To maintain the January 2001 city staffing level of 0.77 regular City employees per thousand population, there would need to be about 27 city staff members, a 108 percent increase over the 13-employee level, and a 93 percent increase in employees over the total 14 employees budgeted for the year 2001. To accommodate 27 staff members at the 286 square feet per person, the City Hall space would need to equal approximately 7,720 square feet. On a per capita basis, this is 0.244 per capita assuming City residents and 0.218 per capita assuming full Planning Area residents.	If applying the January 2001 employee rate of 0.77, there would need to be 27 City Staff members, a 108 percent increase over the 13-employee level and a 93 percent increase over the Year 2001 budgeted 14-employee level. The Preferred Alternative’s Capital Facility Plan assumes construction of a 15,000-square foot City Hall, likely built as part of a Civic Center in the Downtown Concept B area. The square foot per capita would be 0.478 assuming the future City population, or 0.427 per capita assuming the future Planning Area population.
Mitigation Measure Summary	Comprehensive Plan goals, objectives, and policies would act as mitigation and are identified in the EIS analysis.		
Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts	No significant unavoidable adverse City facility impacts are anticipated with implementation of either Alternative 1, No Action, or Alternative 2, Modified Plans, or the Preferred Alternative.		
FIRE/EMERGENCY SERVICES			
Impacts	The additional population of Alternative 1 would require the District to have 14 additional firefighters to serve Kenmore.	The additional population of Alternative 2 would require the District to have 15 additional firefighters to serve Kenmore	Same as Alternative 2.
Mitigation Measure Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none">All new developments would be required to meet Uniform Building and Fire Code requirements for built-in fire protection systems (alarm and sprinkler systems).Street improvements would provide better access for emergency vehicles.Prior to construction, a plan for response to accidents and other emergencies would need to be developed for each development and redevelopment project. Areas of concern would be potential trench or structural collapses and access to tall structures. Additionally, Comprehensive Plan goals, objectives, and policies would act as mitigation and are identified in the EIS analysis.		
Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts	No significant unavoidable adverse fire protection or emergency service impacts would be anticipated with development under Alternative 1, No Action, or Alternative 2, Modified Plans, or the Preferred Alternative.		

ENVIRONMENTAL TOPIC	ALTERNATIVE 1 NO ACTION: EXISTING PLANS	ALTERNATIVE 2 MODIFIED PLANS	PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
LIBRARY SERVICES			
Impacts	Assuming the Kenmore branch only, to maintain the current square foot per capita, an additional 1,680 square feet would be needed. To maintain the current volumes per capita, an additional 22,204 volumes would be needed. If the 5,250 square foot library facility is built, the square foot per capita in the Planning Area would be 0.154, or if the 10,000 square foot library facility is built, the square foot per capita would equal 0.293.	Assuming the Kenmore branch only, to maintain the current square foot per capita, an additional 1,845 square feet would be needed. To maintain the current volumes per capita, an additional 24,354 volumes would be needed. The square foot per capita (Planning Area) would equal 0.148 or 0.282 for the 5,250 square foot or 10,000 square foot library facility, respectively.	Assuming the Kenmore branch only, to maintain the current square foot per capita, an additional 1,805 square feet would be needed. To maintain the current volumes per capita, an additional 23,847 volumes would be needed. The square foot per capita (Planning Area) would equal 0.149 or 0.284 for the 5,205 square foot or the 10,000 square foot library facility, respectively.
Mitigation Measure Summary	Comprehensive Plan goals, objectives, and policies would act as mitigation and are identified in the EIS analysis.		
Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts	No significant unavoidable adverse library service impacts would be anticipated with development under Alternative 1, No Action, or Alternative 2, Modified Plans, or the Preferred Alternative.		
PARKS AND RECREATION			
Impacts	Under Alternative 1, to maintain a rate of 2 acres per thousand, the City would need to provide 26 additional acres of local parks. To increase the rate to 7 acres per thousand, the City would need to provide 205 additional acres of local parks. The City would require additional acreage for local and neighborhood parks to meet national level of service recommendations. Additional population would also increase the demand on regional and state facilities. To address an appropriate distribution of local parks in the community, parks would need to be added to the northwest Kenmore, northeast Kenmore, and central Kenmore, as well as pockets in southeast Kenmore.	Under Alternative 2, to maintain a rate of 2 acres per thousand, the City would need to provide 28 additional acres of local parks. To increase the rate to 7 acres per thousand, the City would need to provide 214 additional acres of local parks. The City would require additional acreage for local and neighborhood parks to meet national level of service recommendations. Additional population would also increase the demand upon regional and state facilities. To address an appropriate distribution of local parks in the community, parks would need to be added to the northwest Kenmore, northeast Kenmore, and central Kenmore, as well as pockets in southeast Kenmore. The Draft Surface Water Management Plan proposes some surface water facilities in Kenmore, Swamp Creek, and Tracy Owen Parks. Short-term impacts could include	Under the Preferred Alternative, to maintain a rate of 2 acres per thousand, the City would need to provide 28 additional acres of local parks. To increase the rate to 7 acres per thousand the City would need to provide 212 additional acres of local parks. The City would require additional acreage for local and neighborhood parks to meet national level of service recommendations. Additional population would also increase the demand upon regional and state facilities. To address an appropriate distribution of local parks in the community, parks would need to be added to the northwest Kenmore, northeast Kenmore, and central Kenmore, as well as pockets in southeast Kenmore. Potential impacts associated with the Final Surface Water Management Plan, 2001 would be similar to Alternative 2.

ENVIRONMENTAL TOPIC	ALTERNATIVE 1 NO ACTION: EXISTING PLANS	ALTERNATIVE 2 MODIFIED PLANS	PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
		some inconvenience to park users during installation of water quality improvement features and long-term impacts could include a small reduction in space that is available to park users. Additionally, stormwater maintenance activities could affect Wallace Swamp Creek Park. Refer to the Fish and Wildlife section for a discussion of potential impacts due to implementation of conceptual park improvements.	Refer to the Fish and Wildlife section for a discussion of potential impacts due to implementation of conceptual park improvements.
Mitigation Measure Summary	Comprehensive Plan goals, objectives, and policies would act as mitigation and are identified in the EIS analysis. Also refer to Stormwater mitigation listed below.		
Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts	No significant unavoidable adverse park and recreation impacts would be anticipated with development under Alternative 1, No Action, or Alternative 2, Modified Plans, or the Preferred Alternative since appropriate levels of service have been determined by City decisionmakers.		
POLICE SERVICES			
Impacts	To maintain the current level of service, 13 additional officers would be needed. To achieve the typical contract amount, the number of additional officers would equal 12. To increase the level of service to the recommended national standard, 69 additional officers would be needed.	To maintain the current level of service, 14 additional officers would be needed. To achieve the typical contract amount, the number of additional officers would equal 13. To increase the level of service to the recommended national standard, 72 additional officers would be needed.	To maintain the current level of service, 14 additional officers would be needed. To achieve the typical contract amount, the number of additional officers would equal 12. To increase the level of service to the recommended national standard, 71 additional officers would be needed.
Mitigation Measure Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Improvements to streets and the addition of new streets would improve access for emergency vehicles and could reduce emergency response times. Refer to Policy T-29.3.1 and T-29.3.2. Other Comprehensive Plan goals, objectives, and policies would act as mitigation and are identified in the EIS analysis.		
Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts	No significant unavoidable adverse police protection impacts would be anticipated with development under Alternative 1, No Action, or Alternative 2, Modified Plans, or the Preferred Alternative, since appropriate level of service standards have been determined by City decisionmakers.		
SCHOOLS			
Impacts	Population growth in the City and the Kenmore-Bothell Joint Study area would result in an increased number of students entering the Northshore School District: 1,250 elementary students, 464 junior high students, and 362 high school students.	Because Alternative 2 would result in more dwellings than Alternative 1, Alternative 2 would result in a larger increase in students in the Northshore School District: 1,365 elementary students, 507 junior high students, and 395 high school students.	The Preferred Alternative would result in new dwellings within the range of Alternatives 1 and 2. The increase in students is projected as 1,341 elementary students, 497 junior high students, and 388 high school students.

ENVIRONMENTAL TOPIC	ALTERNATIVE 1 NO ACTION: EXISTING PLANS	ALTERNATIVE 2 MODIFIED PLANS	PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
	The number of students generated in the Lake Washington School District is minimal, and may perhaps be accommodated by the District’s growth projections that are updated with each 6-year Capital Facility Plan.	The number of students generated in the Lake Washington School District is minimal, and may perhaps be accommodated by the District’s growth projections that are updated with each 6-year Capital Facility Plan.	The number of students generated in the Lake Washington School District is minimal, and may perhaps be accommodated by the District’s growth projections that are updated with each 6-year Capital Facility Plan.
Mitigation Measure Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none">The goal of creating pedestrian-oriented streets could include sidewalks, bus pick-up areas for school children, and any accommodations necessary for children with special needs.Application of School District six-year capital facility plans, and adoption of impact fees, would address growth impacts. Additionally, Comprehensive Plan goals, objectives, and policies would act as mitigation and are identified in the EIS analysis.		
Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts	No significant unavoidable adverse education system impacts are anticipated with Alternative 1, No Action, or Alternative 2, Modified Plans, or the Preferred Alternative, since the school districts monitor and plan for growth in their six-year capital facility plans, and since appropriate impact fees are determined to address growth.		
STORMWATER			
Impacts	<p><i>General Citywide</i></p> <p>Additional impervious surfaces due to development could result in runoff overwhelming the existing drainage system, and would require, drainage improvements, such as culverts, curbs, gutters, open channels, or storm sewers to direct and convey the runoff.</p> <p><i>Surface Water Management</i></p> <p>Under this Alternative, structural solutions to address existing surface water quantity and quality problems would not be made, and there could be continued localized flooding problems, and continued water quality degradation from highway runoff.</p>	<p><i>General Citywide</i></p> <p>Impacts of surface water runoff from additional impervious surfaces would be similar to Alternative 1.</p> <p><i>Draft Surface Water Management Plan</i></p> <p>Structural solutions to address surface water quantity and quality problems could result in short-term erosion, traffic congestion, and impacts to wetlands and streams if not properly executed. Where surface water facilities would be added to parks, there could be impacts to future park plans or uses.</p>	<p><i>General Citywide</i></p> <p>Impacts of surface water runoff from additional impervious surfaces would be similar to Alternative 1.</p> <p><i>Final Surface Water Management Plan</i></p> <p>Impacts associated with structural improvements would be similar to Alternative 2. Nonstructural solutions such as property buyouts near Swamp Creek would require relocation of some residents in accordance with applicable local, state or federal procedures as appropriate.</p>
Mitigation Measure Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none">The Final Surface Water Management Plan, 2001 contains recommended solutions related to stormwater quantity and surface water quality problems.Constructed solutions to drainage problems will be subject to public review on a case-by-case basis by agencies such as the Puget Sound Water Quality Authority, the Department of Ecology, and King County Department of Natural Resources as well as other interested agencies. Specific mitigation measures will be determined at that time.For those water quality improvement projects that could potentially be installed in Tracy Owen, Kenmore, or Swamp Creek parks,		

ENVIRONMENTAL TOPIC	ALTERNATIVE 1 NO ACTION: EXISTING PLANS	ALTERNATIVE 2 MODIFIED PLANS	PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
	negotiations would be held with City and/or King County parks department staff to determine the alternative best suited for each site. (See Objective 42.9, below.)		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Proposed development is concentrated in the Downtown area, reducing impacts to outlying areas.For Alternative 2, or the Preferred Alternative, the Public/Private Institution designation of parks and open space would help maintain current uses and would reduce development potential in these areas.Retrofitting water quality improvement facilities in public parks would provide an opportunity for public education benefits on the need for stewardship of water resources.		
	Additionally, Comprehensive Plan goals, objectives, and policies would act as mitigation and are identified in the EIS analysis.		
Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts	Additional development adding impervious surfaces could alter stormwater volumes at various locations in the City. Existing water quantity problems would be addressed with Alternative 2, and particularly the Preferred Alternative with its more refined solutions to the Swamp Creek basin problems, but not by Alternative 1. All Alternatives address stormwater requirements for new development, but Alternative 2, or the Preferred Alternative, would strengthen these requirements.		
	Even with mitigation, runoff from built surfaces would contain some level of sediments and pollutants of the type normally associated with urban runoff. These would be conveyed into drainage ways and wetlands in the study area. All three Alternatives include surface water regulations, although Alternative 2, or the Preferred Alternative, would strengthen these regulations and recommend retrofitting existing road facilities with water quality treatment. To the extent that future regulations (adopted by the City of Kenmore in response to the Endangered Species Act 4(d) rule, or in response to other federal, State, or local laws) would address water quality requirements, it may be possible to further minimize surface water impacts. The level of significance of surface water impacts would be more precisely determined through project-specific environmental review.		
WATER/WASTEWATER			
Impacts	The population growth associated with Alternative 1 would require approximately 3,074,580 gallons of water per day.	For Alternative 2, the projected population would require 3,187,260 gallons of water per day.	For the Preferred Alternative, the projected Planning Area population would require 3,160,710 gallons of water per day.
	The projected population would discharge approximately 2,527.988 gallons of sewage per day.	For Alternative 2, the projected population would generate 2,620,636 gallons of sewage per day.	With the Preferred Alternative, the projected Planning Area population would generate 2,598,806 gallons of sewage per day.
	The above demand estimates would decrease if the District’s household size estimates were used, resulting in lower populations. Refer to the Land Use Plans Section.	The above demand estimates would decrease if the District’s household size estimates were used, resulting in lower populations. Refer to the Land Use Plans Section.	The above demand estimates would decrease if the District’s household size estimates were used, resulting in lower populations. Refer to the Land Use Plans Section.

ENVIRONMENTAL TOPIC	ALTERNATIVE 1 NO ACTION: EXISTING PLANS	ALTERNATIVE 2 MODIFIED PLANS	PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
Mitigation Measure Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none">It is anticipated that few new water supply delivery lines or wastewater removal lines would have to be added to the existing system to accommodate growth because concentration of development in the Downtown area would minimize the need to add new distribution or removal facilities. However, utility line sizes may need to be increased Downtown depending on the location of concentrated growth in relation to local lines. Utility improvements would be subject to environmental review prior to their construction. <p>Additionally, Comprehensive Plan goals, objectives, and policies would act as mitigation and are identified in the EIS analysis.</p>		
Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts	Since water and wastewater system capacities would be determined prior to development approval, and since there will be coordination with the Utility district regarding growth estimates, significant unavoidable adverse impacts would not be anticipated with Alternative 1, No Action, or Alternative 2, Modified Plans, or the Preferred Alternative.		
SOLID WASTE			
Impacts	For Alternative 1, new residents would generate roughly 10,087 additional tons of waste per year. A greater number of multi-family residential units would be proposed in a centralized area, reducing collection time and effort.	For Alternative 2, new residents would generate about 11,064 additional tons of waste per year. A greater number of multi-family residential units would be proposed in a centralized area, reducing collection time and effort.	For the Preferred Alternative, new residents would generate 10,833 additional tons of waste per year. A greater number of multi-family residential units would be proposed in a centralized area, reducing collection time and effort.
Mitigation Measure Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none">King County Solid Waste Division offers grants to cities to establish city-sponsored waste reduction and recycling projects. At the time of this writing Kenmore had not yet participated, but may wish to consider participation in the future. The County also sponsors a “Greenworks” Business Recycling Program to help businesses and institutions develop and expand waste prevention and recycling programs. The City could consider working with this program as well. <p>Additionally, Comprehensive Plan goals, objectives, and policies would act as mitigation and are identified in the EIS analysis.</p>		
Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts	No significant unavoidable adverse solid waste disposal impacts would be anticipated with development under Alternative 1, No Action, or Alternative 2, Modified Plans, or the Preferred Alternative as the City intends to monitor, coordinate, and plan for solid waste services with appropriate agencies.		

CONCISE ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVES

Alternative 1, No Action, or Alternative 2, Modified Plans, or now the Preferred Alternative, have been proposed as potential Comprehensive Plans and are considered non-project actions under SEPA. *By themselves as non-projects*, the Alternatives would not have direct impacts to the environment. The Alternatives would have indirect impacts by changing the allowable uses and amount of potential development of the properties, or facilitating the implementation of future infrastructure or other public improvements. Future development, or infrastructure projects, allowed by the Alternatives could directly or indirectly affect elements of the environment. This EIS addresses, at a programmatic level, the potential environmental impacts assuming implementation of any of the three Alternatives studied. At the time a project-specific development is proposed, applicants would be required to submit project-specific development applications and environmental review documents for review by the City or other appropriate governmental entity.

NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

Earth

Affected Environment

Please refer to **Chapter 4D, Natural Environment Sub-Element**, of this Comprehensive Plan for further background information related to landforms and geology. Basic findings include:

- Much of the City of Kenmore is comprised of undulating uplands where stream erosion, following periods of glaciation, carved gullies and ravines. Individual drift plains and alternating valleys create a north-south “ridge and valley” regional topography, the principal direction of glacial movement through the region. The Sammamish River bisects Kenmore near where it empties into Lake Washington. Steeper slopes are found along ravines cut by streams.
- Predominant soil associations found in the City of Kenmore and Joint Study Areas include the Alderwood series, Everett series, and Alderwood-Kitsap-Indianola series, which are moderately to excessively drained.
- Geologic hazard areas in Kenmore include hillsides prone to erosion and landslides as well as low-lying areas where settlement or soil liquefaction could result from seismic activity.
- The King County Sensitive Areas Map Folio identifies the region of Swamp Creek, the Sammamish River basin, and the northern end of Lake Washington north of NE 166th Place as seismic hazard areas primarily due to the potential for soil liquefaction. Seismic (liquefaction) hazard areas usually coincide with the 100-year floodplain areas.

Impacts

General Citywide

The following impacts apply to either Alternative 1: No Action, or Alternative 2: Modified Plans, or the Preferred Alternative:

- Development or redevelopment of property for residential, commercial, or public purposes, or the installation of infrastructure (e.g., road, drainage¹, etc.) could result in short-term erosion during the earth-moving phase of work. The magnitude of erosion potential would depend on such factors as phasing of construction, extent of clearing/asphalt removal, extent of grading, time of year during which work occurred, and effectiveness of erosion control measures.

Alternative 2 includes the Draft Kenmore Surface Water Management Plan, and the Preferred Alternative includes the **Final Kenmore Surface Water Management Plan, 2001**. In comparison to Alternative 1, existing surface water management and regulations, the Draft and the Final Surface Water Management Plan include recommended actions to apply greater surface water standards to new development (more proposals would be required to undergo drainage review), additional construction site inspections for storm drainage and erosion control requirements, additional surface water requirements for developments that drain towards sensitive slopes, and public education programs for property and business owners in existing developed areas to reduce non-point pollution including the control of erosion from every day human activities.

- The risk of earthquake is most severe in the region of Swamp Creek, the Sammamish River basin, and the northern end of Lake Washington north of NE 166th Place where soil conditions could facilitate liquefaction. Under either Alternative 1, or Alternative 2, or the Preferred Alternative, without proper soil preparation and structural design, building failures and possible collapse could occur. Roadways, bridges, and utilities are subject to damage and failure. Utility and roadway damage can hinder rescue, repair, and reconstruction. Construction of critical facilities, such as fire, police, schools and others in areas of liquefaction can increase the risk of severe problems.
- The potential for erosion and landslide potential exist in portions of Kenmore with steeper slopes having unstable soils or geologic formations. Erosion-prone soils combined with an inclined slope can result in excessive downslope movement. Erosion problems are exacerbated with land clearing and development. Earthquakes, undermining of a slope by humans or flowing rivers, unusually heavy rains, excessive landscape watering, or focusing of storm runoff can cause erosion or landsliding. These impacts could occur with the implementation of either Alternative 1, or Alternative 2, or the Preferred Alternative.

Downtown

- Concept A would result in redevelopment in the vicinity of a recognized wetland where soils disturbed during the construction phase of work could, if not properly managed, result in sediments reaching the Class 1 wetland, impacting its functions and values.
- Under Concept B, redevelopment would occur in previously urbanized areas. Without erosion-controlling measures, earth-moving activities during the construction phase could result in off-site erosion and sedimentation.
- Concept C would result in earth-moving activities as described for Concept B as well as additional areas adjacent to the Sammamish River east of 68th Avenue NE. Redevelopment along the river would occur in a seismic hazard zone.

¹ The erosion/sedimentation impacts of various stormwater improvements are addressed further in Tables ENV-O and P in the **Stormwater** section of this EIS.

Mitigation

General Citywide/Downtown

- As required under the 1998 King County Surface Water Design Manual (KCSWDM, adopted by the City of Kenmore), any earth-moving activities would require general measures for erosion and sedimentation control, including construction best management practices (BMPs), clearing and grading limits, maintaining building sites during construction, and revegetation of disturbed areas immediately after completion of work.
- Each development project would be required to have a Temporary Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan (TESCP) prior to clearing and construction.
- Each project would be required to comply with the City's Municipal Code and Uniform Building Code.
- Under Downtown Concept A, buffer zones would be established during the construction phase of work to prevent earth-moving activities from disturbing sensitive areas.
- With Alternatives 2 or the Preferred, the Public/Private Institution designation on parks and open space lands would limit development in areas where clearing and grading could result in erosion and sedimentation.
- With the Preferred Alternative, the Special Study Area overlay district applied to the St. Thomas Seminary (Bastyr) will require master planning in consideration of environmental features and long-term goals of institutional and joint public use.
- Policies in the Comprehensive Plan to protect open space and environmentally sensitive areas would prevent disturbances in those areas.
- Goal 13 states: "Practice environmental stewardship by protecting, enhancing, and promoting the natural environment in and around the City of Kenmore."
- Goal 14 of the Comprehensive Plan is to "Protect life and property in areas of natural hazards."

Objective 14.2 is to "Strive to protect slopes from erosion and sliding." Associated policies would require retention of natural vegetation, erosion control measures, increased surface water requirements, limitation of development on slopes over 40 percent, or in landslide hazard areas unless risks of development can be reduced to non-significant levels.

Objective 14.3 is to "Minimize the potential for damage due to liquefaction and seismic hazards." The related policy would apply the Uniform Building Code and other special design and construction measures to minimize seismic impacts.

Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

Unavoidable adverse impacts as a result of future development under any alternative could include some increase in soil loss during construction. Alternative 2 or the Preferred Alternative would provide additional surface water controls (both during construction and after) than currently exist under Alternative 1. To the extent that future regulations [adopted by the City of Kenmore in response to the

Endangered Species Act 4(d) rule, or in response to other federal, State, or local laws] would further address erosion control requirements, it may be possible to minimize erosion impacts. Impacts will be more precisely determined at a project-specific level.

No Alternative completely restricts development in areas that have the potential for seismic, landslide, or erosion hazards. Even sites that are regulated by the City's sensitive areas ordinances may be developed to some extent. Development on sites with geologic hazards will always pose some risk, however slight.

Air Quality

Affected Environment

Please refer **Chapter 4D, Natural Environment Sub-Element**, of this Comprehensive Plan for further background information. Basic findings include:

- The Puget Sound region has recently attained federal and state air quality standards.
- Air quality concerns are largely based on pollutants generated by automobiles. These emissions threaten Kenmore's ambient air quality more than other pollutants and need to be monitored more closely. Modeling done for the LakePointe Mixed Use Master Plan Final SEIS indicates stabilization or a slight decrease in ozone and carbon monoxide levels by 2010 along Kenmore's most heavily traveled corridor, Bothell Way NE (SR-522).
- Air quality in Kenmore is predicted to remain much as it is today or to improve slightly. This is based on the continuation of the inspection and maintenance program for monitoring vehicle emissions and the decreased dependence on wood as a primary heat source as newer housing replaces older units. Cleaner burning fuels and more fuel-efficient cars will also contribute to reductions in air-borne pollutants.
- Implementation of zoning responsive to air quality concerns, such as concentrated development and high density zoning, can result in generally improved air quality when public transit becomes a more attractive option for urban travelers.

Impacts

- Increased population due to redevelopment would result in additional traffic in the immediate vicinity and an increase in airborne pollutants from vehicles. Alternative 1 would result in an estimated 186,800 total daily vehicle trips. Alternative 2 would result in an estimated 193,730 total daily vehicle trips. The Preferred Alternative would result in 191,900 total daily vehicle trips.
- Construction activity would have temporary impacts on air quality, including emissions from construction vehicles and increased suspended particulates (dust and smoke) during earth-moving activities and from unfinished roads.
- New residential development could include installation of wood-burning stoves that could impact air quality if used during certain weather conditions.
- By concentrating development in the Downtown area, fewer trips to outlying reaches of the City would be generated than with a dispersed pattern. Alternative 2 would provide a more concentrated development pattern with larger areas of mixed-use than Alternative 1, although Alternative 1 does

provide some areas for mixed-use development. The Preferred Alternative has larger mixed-use areas than Alternative 1, but a little less than Alternative 2. Policies associated with Alternative 2 or the Preferred Alternative (Policies LU-6.2.3 and T-34.2.1) also address creation of a local transit circulator route.

- Alternative 2 or the Preferred Alternative would eliminate the Industrial classification. The change from Industrial to Commercial uses could reduce point sources of air pollutants over time.

Mitigation

- Construction contractors would have to comply with Puget Sound Air Pollution Control Agency (PSAPCA) regulations requiring all reasonable precautions be taken to avoid dust emissions. Construction-related traffic could be scheduled to avoid peak hour traffic.
- Goal 13 of the Comprehensive Plan is to “Practice environmental stewardship by protecting, enhancing, and promoting the natural environment in and around the City of Kenmore.”

Objective 13.1: “Cooperate regionally and strive locally to improve air quality.” Associated policies would encourage alternative modes of transportation, promote mixed-use and compact development forms, require air quality impact analyses for major new developments, as well as addressing other actions.

- Goal 29 of the Transportation Element is to “Develop an efficient, safe, and environmentally sensitive road system that supports desired development patterns.”

Objective 29.6 is to “Cooperate regionally and strive locally to improve air quality and surface water quality.”

- Actions that reduce traffic volumes, increase average travel speeds, or reduce congestion and delay at intersections would tend to reduce emissions and related pollutant concentrations. Please refer to the **Transportation** section of this EIS for further discussion of traffic-mitigating measures.

Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

Currently the Puget Sound region is in compliance with federal and state air quality standards. Additional development in the Planning Area, under any Alternative examined in this EIS, will contribute to the regional pollutant burden. Concentrated mixed-use development proposed under any of the Alternatives may be beneficial to countywide and regional air quality. However, there could be localized increases in air pollutant emissions due to traffic increases that would require monitoring and mitigation where appropriate.

Surface Water

Affected Environment

This section addresses surface water as an aspect of the natural environment. Stormwater is considered separately under the **Built Environment** later in this section. Please refer to the **City of Kenmore Final Surface Water Management Plan, 2001** as well as **Chapters 4D, Natural Environment Sub-Element, and 8, Surface Water Element**, of this Comprehensive Plan for further background information related to this element. Other references that may be consulted include the Swamp Creek Watershed

Management Plan (1994), the Swamp Creek Action Plan (1997), and the **Swamp Creek Flood Reduction Study** (2001). Basic findings include:

- Predominant water features in the City include Swamp Creek as well as its tributaries and associated wetlands, the Sammamish River, and Lake Washington. Throughout the City numerous small, unnamed streams drain to these features.
- The Department of Ecology has designated Lake Washington a "Lake Class" water as its water quality does not violate requirements for all or significantly all uses. The Sammamish River has been designated as a Class AA water (extraordinary) along its length from the Marymoor Park Bridge to Kenmore by Ecology for the same reasons cited above. Water quality in the City is being compromised by low dissolved oxygen, high fecal coliform counts, and high nutrient concentrations, possibly due to failing septic systems, lack of riparian cover, and stormwater runoff.
- Lake Washington is considered a Class 1 shoreline in the 1990 King County Sensitive Areas Map Folio. The Sammamish River is considered a Class 1 stream with salmonids.
- The 1990 King County Sensitive Areas Map Folio listed Swamp Creek as a Class 1 stream. At the time of that determination the stream supported both anadromous and resident fish, based on low water temperatures, sufficient dissolved oxygen, sufficient food, clean gravel for spawning, and riffles for aquatic insects.
- Little Swamp Creek flows from the northeast to join Swamp Creek in Swamp Creek Wetland 3. This creek is listed in the 1990 King County Sensitive Areas Map Folio as a Class 2 stream, with salmonids.
- Water quality in Swamp Creek at the time of this writing is being impacted by growth in the watershed. It currently exhibits characteristics typical of streams that drain urban and agricultural watersheds: high turbidity levels during storm events due to erosion and sediment transport and low oxygen levels during summer low-flow periods due to decay of large amounts of organic material.
- Flooding in Swamp Creek has become more frequent as a result of urbanization in its 15,687-acre watershed that extends outside of the City of Kenmore and north into Snohomish County. The current two-year flood at 720 cubic feet per second (cfs) is greater than the historic 100-year flood of 624 cfs. Properties that used to flood with a frequency of once in 100 years now flood every other year.
- Pollutants in Swamp Creek come from a variety of sources including parking lot and highway runoff, excessive lawn and garden chemical use, improper disposal of yard waste, pet waste, failing septic systems, and poor business waste disposal.
- At the time of this writing, there are no water quality improvement facilities that treat stormwater runoff from SR-522 and contaminants related to vehicle use are carried directly to local waterways.

Impacts

General Citywide

- Under all Alternatives, construction-phase earth moving would expose underlying soils and could result in sediments being transported to local waterways.

- Additional urbanization, particularly the increase in impervious surfaces, could have adverse effects on streams and receiving waters; these include increases in flooding, streambank erosion, and pollutant transport.
- After buildout of any Alternative, stormwater runoff from urbanized areas, especially roads and parking lots, will carry heavy metals and petroleum hydrocarbons as well as pesticides and nutrients from landscaping and pet waste to nearby waterways.
- Alternative 2 includes the Draft Surface Water Management Plan, and the Preferred Alternative includes the **Final Surface Water Management Plan 2001**, which, in comparison to Alternative 1, recommend increased surface water requirements for new development (both during and after construction) and redevelopment, water quality facility retrofitting of roads, an illicit discharge detection and elimination program, and public education programs for property and business owners in existing developed areas to reduce non-point pollution, including the control of erosion from everyday human activities.
- Increased residential population and local employment associated with any Alternative will result in more vehicle miles traveled on city streets, increasing automobile-related nonpoint source water pollutants. In comparison to Alternative 1, Alternative 2 could result in a higher population and employment level and associated vehicle miles traveled. The Preferred Alternative results in population and employment levels and associated vehicle miles traveled within the range of Alternatives 1 and 2. As described above, Alternative 2 or the Preferred Alternative includes recommended water quality facility retrofitting on certain roads whereas Alternative 1 would continue current surface water regulations.

Downtown

- Redevelopment under Concept A would occur primarily in a small portion of the Swamp Creek drainage basin, adjacent to a delineated wetland.
- Redevelopment under Concept B would primarily occur in the North Lake Washington drainage basin where surface water runoff currently drains to Lake Washington through a piped conveyance system lacking water quality improvement facilities.
- Under Concept C redevelopment would occur within the Sammamish River basin, a portion of which is within the 100-year floodplain. For a more detailed discussion of flooding impacts Citywide and Downtown, refer to the **Stormwater** analysis in under the **Built Environment** later in this section.
- Under Concepts B and C, reduction of exposed surface parking (Comprehensive Plan Goal 4, Policy LU-4.1.1) would reduce nonpoint source pollution as well as elevated temperatures of street/parking lot runoff draining to Swamp Creek, the Sammamish River, and Lake Washington.

Mitigation

General Citywide/Downtown

- Under all alternatives, new development and redevelopment would have to meet both core and special requirements in the 1998 KCSWDM before receiving building permits. Any surface water management projects would be subject to requirements listed in the KCSWDM and each would be subject to review by a number of regulatory agencies.

- The City of Kenmore has developed a **Final Surface Water Management Plan, 2001** to address drainage issues. (Please refer to the **Stormwater** Section, below.) Solutions for water quality and quantity problems are included in the plan.
- The Washington State Department of Ecology requires a Shoreline Master Program substantial development permit for significant development adjacent to waterways. Until Kenmore prepares its own Shoreline Master Program, Kenmore will continue to apply King County Shoreline Master Program guidelines for new construction projects adjacent to waterways. The existing King County Sensitive Areas Ordinance, adopted by the City of Kenmore, requires buffers adjacent to wetlands and waterways.
- The National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) will publish a Stormwater Management Checklist in 2001 that will be consistent with elements required under the Phase II National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES), the Puget Sound Water Quality Management Plan (PSWQMP), and the Growth Management Act (GMA). The collective goal of these regulations is the protection of water resources. (Please see **Stormwater**, below.)
- Extension of sewer lines to serve all residences should improve water quality in receiving waterways.
- The Comprehensive Plan includes Goal 13: “Practice environmental stewardship by protecting, enhancing, and promoting the natural environment in and around the City of Kenmore.” Associated objectives include:

Objective 13.4: “Cooperate regionally and strive locally to protect surface and groundwater quality and quantity from degradation.”

Objective 13.5: “Adopt an urban forestry strategy to encourage the preservation and planting of trees on public and private property.”

Objective 13.6: “Protect the natural, environmental, ecological, public access, aesthetic, and economic aspects of Lake Washington, the Sammamish River, and Swamp Creek.”

- Goal 14 states: “Protect life and property in areas of natural hazards,” and Objective 14.1 states: “Strive to protect lives and public and private property from flooding.” These and the associated policies address implementation strategies and land use patterns that would help reduce flooding impacts.
- The Comprehensive Plan includes Goal 15: “Protect and enhance unique, valuable, and critical plants and wildlife.” An associated objective includes Objective 15.2: “Protect streams from encroachment and degradation, and encourage stream restoration.”
- Goal 34, supporting public transportation and reducing the need for automobile travel, as well as its associated objectives and policies, would reduce reliance on automobiles and would help reduce automobile-related contaminants entering runoff that is directed to waterways.
- The **Surface Water Element (Chapter 8)** contains a number of objectives and policies to help the City reach its goal of developing and maintaining a surface water system that serves the community, enhances the quality of life, and protects the environment. (Goal 42)

Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

Increases in resident population and employment will increase the number of vehicle miles traveled on city streets, leading to higher levels of vehicle-related pollutants reaching natural waterways. Other sources of diffuse water pollution will result from increased levels of human activity, such as pet waste and poor gardening practices. Alternatives 1, 2, or the Preferred Alternative include surface water regulations, although Alternative 2 or the Preferred Alternative would strengthen these regulations and recommend retrofitting existing road facilities with water quality treatment. To the extent that future regulations [adopted by the City of Kenmore in response to the Endangered Species Act 4(d) rule, or in response to other federal, State, or local laws] would address water quality requirements, it may be possible to further minimize surface water impacts. The level of significance of surface water impacts would be more precisely determined through project-specific environmental review.

Fish and Wildlife

Affected Environment

Please refer to **Chapter 4D, Natural Environment Sub-Element**, of this Comprehensive Plan for background information. Basic findings include:

- In Kenmore and the Joint Study Areas, fish and wildlife habitat is found in wetlands, stream corridors including Swamp Creek, and along the Sammamish River as well as the Lake Washington shoreline. The Lake Washington shoreline has little natural vegetation or habitat left as most has been developed with urban uses, though St. Edward State Park is the largest undeveloped parcel of land adjacent to Lake Washington.
- Salmonid populations in the Swamp Creek watershed have decreased significantly since the late 1970s. Overharvesting of adult fish in Lake Washington, severe predation by river otters, a debris jam blockage in Swamp Creek Wetland #3 (King County Sensitive Areas Map Folio), and urbanization in the upper watershed have resulted in fewer salmonids reared in the Study Area.
- Swamp Creek Wetland #3 provides some forage and nesting habitat for birds as well as for amphibians, reptiles, and small mammals. Ponded areas in the wetland provide resting sites for waterfowl. Within this wetland is a heron rookery that has grown from about 24 nests in 1990 to 35 nests in 1996, large by urban standards. It is considered extremely important because of its continuity and size.
- Consequences of earlier Sammamish River flood control projects include reduced frequency of overbank flooding, reduced riparian habitat, and elimination of extensive wetland areas. Channelization and associated maintenance practices have significantly impaired fish habitat. Habitat areas as well as density and type of wildlife have been reduced, although some reaches of the river in Kenmore have more plant cover and habitat than others.
- The area of the lake at the mouth of the Sammamish River is a critical point for salmon as they migrate between the Pacific Ocean and their spawning grounds in the Lake Washington basin.
- In the Puget Sound area, chinook salmon is listed as Threatened by the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). Additionally, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) has listed bull trout as Threatened. Both species are found in the Study Area.

- Bald eagles are listed as Threatened by the USFWS, but the species is proposed for de-listing due to its successful recovery. There have been several sightings of bald eagles in the Study Area as described above.
- The State has a Priority Habitat and Species Program that includes bald eagles, great blue herons, and several salmonid and non-salmonid fish species.
- The City of Kenmore has continued the Heron Habitat Overlay Protection Zone originally established in King County regulations. City of Kenmore staff have noted a need to revisit the heron habitat overlay regulations due to conflicting maps and ambiguous language.

Impacts

General Citywide

- Under Alternative 1, or Alternative 2, or the Preferred Alternative, development of parcels in residential zones could occur on or in the vicinity of wetlands or riparian areas. Habitat could be impacted if vegetation were removed and hydrology altered.
- In some cases, new development may be able to use wetland or wetland buffers to provide biofiltration, stormwater detention, or on-site open space and recreation potential. The City wetland regulations also allow off-site replacement of wetlands. There may be situations where larger areas of degraded wetlands would be replaced with acreage of higher quality wetland. The City's policies would still require no-net-loss of wetland functions.
- Alternative 2 or the Preferred Alternative propose transportation capital improvements (see **Table T-R, Chapter 6**) that could affect wetlands and fish and wildlife habitat (e.g., stream crossings) including, but not limited to, the extension of NE 145th Street, bridge widening on SR-522 just west of 80th Avenue NE, and expansion of 61st Avenue NE. The Preferred Alternative would have less impacts than Alternative 2 by eliminating the NE 83rd Place extension over the Sammamish River as a potential improvement (included in the Draft Integrated Comprehensive Plan and EIS). As similar traffic improvements have been modeled for Alternative 1, wetland and fish and wildlife impacts could be similar to either Alternative 2 or the Preferred Alternative if the transportation improvements were adopted along with Alternative 1.
- All alternatives would generate additional growth in the City that would result in increased traffic and human activity. An increased number of vehicles in the Study Area would result in additional nonpoint source pollution entering waterways, impacting fish and wildlife habitat.
- For Alternative 2, the Public/Private Institution designation would help limit development in areas where clearing and grading could result in degradation to habitat areas, such as in the area of Bastyr University. The Preferred Alternative also includes the Public/Private Institution designation with similar benefits to Alternative 2. The Special Study Area District applied to the St. Thomas Seminary (Bastyr) will require master planning in consideration of environmental features and long-term goals of institutional and joint public use.
- Additional urbanization could have adverse effects on streams and receiving waters; these include increases in flooding, streambank erosion, and pollutant transport. Development results in rooftops, roads, parking lots, sidewalks, and driveways that make the affected watershed impervious to rainfall. Under any Alternative, additional impervious surfaces due to development could result in runoff

overwhelming the existing drainage system, and would require, drainage improvements, such as culverts, curbs, gutters, open channels, or storm sewers to direct and convey the runoff. An improved drainage network could result in increases in peak discharges. An increased volume of runoff would be produced by each storm, and runoff takes much less time to reach receiving waters. These could combine to increase the frequency and severity of flooding. Additionally, the reduced infiltration reduces the water available to provide base flows in the receiving waters, and previously perennial streams can become seasonally dry. At the receiving end of the stormwater conveyance network, the stream channel must adapt to the new hydrologic conditions. The primary adjustment is through channel widening, which occurs through streambank erosion. Streambanks become undercut and slump into the channel. Trees that were providing bank stability are exposed at the roots and are more likely to fall. Sediment eroded from the streambanks remain in the channel as shifting deposits of mud and sand. This can impact fish habitat and aquatic insects (a major food resource for fish).

- In comparison to Alternative 1, which continues current standards, Alternative 2 or the Preferred Alternative would include a series of additional regulatory and enhancement proposals particularly relevant to fish habitat, including the following examples: duration matching flow control standard for new development draining to fish-bearing streams; more comprehensive source control site inspection program; additional site inspections during and following construction; an illicit discharge reduction program; design of capital improvement projects to be “fish-friendly”; additional funding for early action and long-term habitat enhancement projects; and, property acquisition in the Swamp Creek watershed.

Downtown

- Concept A, which would focus more redevelopment in the vicinity of the heron rookery and wetland, would result in more short-term construction-related noise, air quality reduction, and heavy equipment traffic in that area. Long-term impacts would include more noise, human activity, and lighting adjacent to the wetland.
- No adverse impacts to habitat would be anticipated under Concept B.
- Redevelopment proposed under Concept C would create additional traffic and activity south of SR-522 and in the vicinity of the Sammamish River east of 68th Avenue NE. During the construction phase of redevelopment, short-term noise, air quality reduction, and heavy equipment traffic would impact wildlife habitat along the river corridor. Long-term impacts would include more traffic, the presence of pets, and night lighting that could impact habitat in the riparian corridor.

Park Concept Plans

Alternative 2 or the Preferred Alternative include potential park improvements to five Kenmore parks. Concept plans are intended to guide the preparation of a Citywide Park Master Plan. Suggested improvements are advisory. More specific environmental analysis will occur as the Citywide Park Master Plan is prepared as well as at the project-specific level.

- Kenmore Park: Potential improvements to Kenmore Park could include regrading the grass area and replacing the irrigation system, and providing a boardwalk and view point along the Sammamish River. During the construction phase, fish and wildlife habitat could be impacted if vegetation important to habitat were removed and hydrology altered. Erosion and consequent sedimentation could occur during the wet-weather season if not properly controlled. Additional trails could increase human activity in fish and wildlife habitat areas.

- Linwood Park: Potential improvements to Linwood Park include a potential through trail, vegetation thinning, and stream clean-up/enhancement. Potential impacts to the stream and other habitat could be similar to those identified for Kenmore Park.
- Logboom (Tracey Owen) Park: Potential improvements to Logboom Park may include expanding the beach along the Lake Washington Shoreline, thinning vegetation to improve views and access, a loop walking trail along the shoreline, improving salmon migration potential of the creek, renovating the dock with lighting, railings, and floating picnic platforms, and other potential improvements. Construction impacts including erosion and sedimentation and increased human activity along shoreline trails could occur as described for Kenmore Park. Lighting associated with the dock could have the potential to extend feeding periods for both salmonids and their predators into the evening hours. Overwater development, such as floating picnic platforms, could result in habitat degradation from shading. Any in-water or near-shore work could impact aquatic habitat and aquatic life.
- Wallace-Swamp Creek Park: Potential improvements to Wallace-Swamp Creek Park include a parking area in the northeastern portion, active recreation in the northeastern quadrant if feasible, and additional trails along Swamp Creek and forested areas and improved habitat in Swamp Creek. Potential impacts to Swamp Creek and associated wetlands related to construction and use of improvements would be similar to those described for Kenmore Park.

Surface Water Management Plan

The following impacts are associated with the Draft Surface Water Management Plan that is proposed with Alternative 2 or with the **Final Surface Water Management Plan, 2001** that is part of the Preferred Alternative:

- Installation of surface water quantity and quality control facilities improvements could result in erosion and consequent sedimentation of receiving waters, if not properly controlled. Refer to **Tables ENV – O and P** in the **Stormwater** section.
- A wetpond or bioswales could be installed in Logboom Park potentially near wetlands; without mitigation, construction near wetlands could have impacts.
- Construction of open wetponds in Swamp Creek Park, Kenmore Park, and the vicinity of NE 175th Street/Sammamish River could impact fish and wildlife habitat if not properly executed.
- At the Harbour Village area, construction of ponds and annual cleaning to address sedimentation could affect tributary 0056. If stream flows are effectively bypassed during construction and annual cleaning, impacts should be minimized.

Alternative 1 would continue current surface water regulations. The consequences of continuing current programs and not implementing recommended surface water improvements are addressed in **Tables EN-O and P**, as the “do nothing” alternative.

Mitigation

General Citywide/Park Concept Plans/Surface Water Management Plan

- King County's Sensitive Areas Ordinance has been adopted by the City of Kenmore and would require appropriate buffers and setbacks from recognized sensitive features.

- Federal and State regulations apply to endangered species and certain key wetlands.
- Development activities in the vicinity of Lake Washington, Sammamish River, and Swamp Creek would require Shoreline Master Program permits.
- For Alternative 2, the Public/Private Institution designation would help limit development in areas where clearing and grading could result in degradation to habitat areas, such as in the area of Bastyr University. The Preferred Alternative also includes the Public/Private Institution designation with similar benefits to Alternative 2. The Special Study Area District applied to the St. Thomas Seminary (Bastyr) will require master planning in consideration of environmental features and long-term goals of institutional and joint public use.
- Goal 15 of the Comprehensive Plan is to “Protect and enhance unique, valuable, and critical plants and wildlife.”

Objective 15.1: “Protect wetlands from encroachment and degradation, and encourage wetland restoration.”

Objective 15.2: “Protect streams from encroachment and degradation, and encourage stream restoration.”

Objective 15.3: “Maintain and promote a diversity of species and habitat within the City.”

- The Comprehensive Plan has a goal of preserving or developing shorelines, adjacent uplands, and adjacent water areas in a manner that assures a balance of shoreline uses with minimal adverse effect on the quality of life, water, and environment. (Goals 16 through 24)
- Policy P-39.1.2 would “... provide environmentally responsible public access to shorelines” and Policy P-39.3.3 would “promote the use of signage to discourage inappropriate use of environmentally sensitive areas and to offer educational information about the sensitive area.”
- Under Goal 10 is Objective 10.2: “Integrate landscaping into streetscapes and developments, and increase the biomass in the community.”
- Goal 38 is to: “Protect environmentally sensitive areas, and improve and increase Kenmore's shoreline access, open space, and parks and recreation opportunities.”

Downtown

- By concentrating development in the Downtown sector (Concepts B and C), extensive earth-moving activities would be confined to that area.
- Redevelopment under Concept C in the vicinity of the Sammamish River would require Shoreline Master Program permits.

Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

Under Alternative 1, or Alternative 2, or the Preferred Alternative, increased urbanization of the City's watersheds could further impact wildlife habitat either directly or indirectly. Direct impacts to fish and wildlife could be avoided or mitigated depending upon development levels and design of residential, commercial, and public uses and infrastructure improvements. Indirect cumulative impacts associated

with changes to habitat quality from non-point source pollution could be partially reduced by surface water management regulations, in particular, with the additional regulations, improvements, and education programs included with the Draft Surface Water Management Plan associated with Alternative 2 and included with the **Final Surface Water Management Plan, 2001** associated with the Preferred Alternative.

To the extent that future sensitive area and surface water regulations are amended or adopted [in response to the Endangered Species Act 4(d) rule, or in response to other federal, State, or local laws] it may be possible to further minimize indirect impacts to fish and wildlife. The level of significance of fish and wildlife impacts would be more precisely determined through project-specific environmental review.

BUILT ENVIRONMENT

Land Use

Affected Environment

Please refer to **Sections 4A and 4B**, the **Land Use Sub-Element and Downtown Sub-Element**, for further background. Basic findings include:

- The City of Kenmore boundaries encompass approximately 6.1 square miles of land, largely in single-family residential land use.
- Most of the Kenmore's single-family residential growth will occur on remaining vacant parcels, estimated at 322 acres in 1999, or as a result of infill development of partially developed properties. However, most of Kenmore's commercial growth would occur as redevelopment of developed lands.
- Most the City is zoned residential with the R-6 classification. Most of the vacant property occurs within the R-6 zone.
- Similar to the City of Kenmore, the Kenmore-Bothell and Kenmore-Kirkland Joint Study Areas primarily contain single-family residential uses.

Impact

- **Displacement.** Implementation of either Alternative 1, No Action, or Alternative 2, Modified Plans, or the Preferred Alternative could result in displacement of existing development where the zoning classification applies a different use category than the current development. Alternative 2 or the Preferred Alternative would displace more industrial uses than Alternative 1, primarily due to the reclassification of Industrially zoned properties to Regional Business. Table **ENV-A** indicates the type of land uses that could be displaced by new development if property owners developed their properties in accordance with the zoning classifications:

In some locations, under either Alternative 1, or 2, or the Preferred Alternative, some existing multi-family developments are designated with single-family zoning classifications particularly Juanita Drive and NE 170th Street. It is unlikely that the multi-family uses would convert to single-family uses. However, the uses in terms of density and building locations, would be non-conforming, and could continue as long as the sites are used for multi-family residential purposes.

**TABLE ENV-A
ESTIMATED CHANGE IN USES**

LAND USE TYPE	ALTERNATIVE 1 CHANGE IN DWELLING UNITS OR SQUARE FEET	ALTERNATIVE 2 CHANGE IN DWELLING UNITS OR SQUARE FEET	PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE CHANGE IN DWELLING UNITS OR SQUARE FEET
Parcels zoned for multi-family uses that do not have multi-family dwellings currently	Added dwellings: 448 Displacing: Commercial - 23,104 s.f. Industrial - 1,800 s.f. Single-family dwellings – 52	Added dwellings: 448 Displacing: Commercial - 23,104 s.f. Industrial -1,800 s.f. Single-family dwellings - 52	Added dwellings: 448 Displacing: Commercial - 23,104 s.f. Industrial -1,800 s.f. Single-family dwellings - 52
Multi-family dwellings occurring on mobile home park sites, should property owners convert to more intense uses allowed in the zone	Net increase in dwellings: 203 Current # of mobile homes that could be converted to multi-family: 253 Total number of multi-family units on these sites: 456	Net increase in dwellings: 257 Current # of mobile homes that could be converted to multi-family: 253 Total number of multi-family units on these sites: 510 ²	Net increase in dwellings: 298 Current # of mobile homes that could be converted to multi-family: 253 Total number of multi-family units on these sites: 551 ³
Single-family dwellings displaced by commercial, office, or industrial development	Added commercial - 25,505 s.f. Added office - 8,831 s.f. Displacing: 9 single-family dwellings	Added commercial - 25,505 s.f. Added office - 2,208 s.f. Displacing: 9 single-family dwellings	Added commercial - 25,505 s.f. Added office - 2,208 s.f. Displacing: 9 single-family dwellings

² The net increase in dwellings does not include multi-family units occurring in the Downtown Concept C area of Alternative 2. If including this, the net increase would equal 272 and the total 525. There is a greater number of units for Alternative 2 than Alternative 1 since one manufactured home park east of Downtown Concept C is anticipated to redevelop to higher densities than current zoning.

³ The total number of multi-family units is higher for the Preferred Alternative than Alternative 2 because two manufactured home properties on NE 175th Street would be designated R-24 as opposed to RB and R-24 under Alternative 2. RB assumptions include that 50% would be developed for commercial/office and 50% for residential.

LAND USE TYPE	ALTERNATIVE 1 CHANGE IN DWELLING UNITS OR SQUARE FEET	ALTERNATIVE 2 CHANGE IN DWELLING UNITS OR SQUARE FEET	PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE CHANGE IN DWELLING UNITS OR SQUARE FEET
Displacement of Industrial Uses by commercial, multi-family, or mixed-use developments	Downtown Concept C displacing industrial: - 62,365 s.f. LakePointe displacing industrial: -55,813 s.f. Parcels zoned for multi-family uses displacing industrial: -1,800 s.f. Increased industrial on vacant or underdeveloped land: 16,966 s.f. Net change: - 103,012 s.f.	Downtown Concept C displacing industrial: - 130,661 s.f. Outside of Downtown, change from Industrial to Regional Business: - 60,567 s.f. LakePointe displacing industrial: - 85,747 s.f. ⁴ Parcels zoned for multi-family uses displacing industrial: - 1,800 s.f. Decrease: - 278,775 s.f.	Downtown Concept C displacing industrial: - 130,661 s.f. Outside of Downtown, change from Industrial to Regional Business: - 60,567 s.f. LakePointe displacing industrial: - 85,747 s.f. ⁴ Parcels zoned for multi-family uses displacing industrial: - 1,800 s.f. Decrease: - 278,775 s.f.

Source: Bucher, Willis and Ratliff Corporation

⁴ The displaced industrial square footage is higher for Alternative 2 or the Preferred Alternative because the alternatives assume that a 5-acre adjacent property currently owned by the LakePointe developers would convert from Industrial to Regional Business.

- **Compatibility.** This section reviews potential land use conflicts of the planned land uses and infill development in general. Land use conflicts arise when the activities of one use, such as commercial, are not compatible with adjacent or nearby uses, such as residential. Conflicts would happen due to hours of operation, traffic, pollutants, trespassing, privacy, etc. Conflicts often arise at the borders of the districts, where, for example, a commercial district abuts a residential district. With some precautions, different uses can co-exist with few conflicts. Precautions can include appropriate setbacks, landscaping, design review, etc. The policy of preserving the character of single-family neighborhoods ensures a high level of compatibility and greatly minimizes potential conflicts.

Generally, for any Alternative studied, there are gradual changes from higher intensity designations to lower intensity designations, such as in central Kenmore: Regional Business surrounded by R-24 multi-family classifications, surrounded by R-18 or R-12 moderate density multi-family classifications, then finally single-family uses. In Alternative 1, or Alternative 2, or the Preferred Alternative, conflicts may arise (e.g. hours of operation, traffic, pollutants, trespassing, privacy) where the Downtown development areas abut single-family areas, or where multi-family, commercial or mixed-use development abuts single-family uses, or where commercial uses abut multi-family. Conflicts may also occur due to different scales of development, such as areas abutting the Downtown. Conflicts areas are located east and west of 68th Avenue NE, north of Bothell Way, and along NE 175th Street.

- **Activity Levels.** The Alternatives allow development of different land uses that generate different patterns of activity. For example, single-family and multi-family residents will leave/return on a daily basis to/from work or school. Office uses would draw employees and patrons to the site during weekdays. Commercial uses would attract patrons and employees during evening hours and weekends as well as weekdays.

The Alternatives will generate additional land uses as shown in **Table ES-D**, page 12-30. New residential, commercial, and office uses could occur on vacant and partially developed land. Redevelopment would occur in the Downtown area primarily over the 20-year planning period. The Alternatives will generate the following percent increases or decreases in development units or square footages over 1999 land use conditions as shown in **Table ENV-B**:

TABLE ENV-B
PERCENT CHANGE IN DEVELOPMENT BY 2020

LAND USE	% CHANGE ALTERNATIVE 1	% CHANGE ALTERNATIVE 2	% CHANGE PREFERRED
Single-Family Dwellings	33%	32%	31%
Multi-Family Dwellings	135%	157%	153%
Commercial Square Feet	101%	141%	131%
Office Square Feet	438%	607%	561%
Industrial Square Feet	-30%	-82%	-82%

Source: Bucher, Willis and Ratliff Corporation

In the Housing Section below, Tables **ENV-J** and **ENV-K** show the percent of housing growth due to different land types. Single-family growth would primarily occur on vacant and partially developed properties. Multi-family growth would primarily occur due to Downtown redevelopment and the addition of the LakePointe development.

Tables **ENV-C** and **ENV-D** in this section indicate the contribution of various land types to the additional commercial and office growth.

**TABLE ENV-C
COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT BREAKDOWN**

LAND TYPE	ALTERNATIVE 1 SQUARE FEET	PERCENT OF TOTAL	ALTERNATIVE 2 SQUARE FEET	PERCENT OF TOTAL	PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
Vacant	60,503.45	8.7%	68,638.10	7.1%	68,638.10	7.6%
Parcels greater than 1 acre and less than \$10,000 in improvement value	18,149.25	2.6%	18,149.25	1.9%	18,149.25	2.0%
Parcels zoned for multi-family uses that do not have multi-family dwellings currently	-23,104.00	-3.3%	-23,104.00	-2.4%	-23,104.00	-2.6%
Transit-Oriented Developments on Park and Ride lots (mixed-use with parking retained)	21,148.38	3.0%	10,802.88 ⁵	1.1%	10,802.88 ⁵	1.2%
Downtown (B/C)	311,282.20	44.7%	456,366.37	47.1%	390,374.27	43.3%
LakePointe	270,952.00	38.9%	270,952.00	28.0%	270,952.00	30.0%
Development permits in pipeline	11,742.00	1.7%	11,742.00	1.2%	11,742.00	1.3%
Development of Industrial as Regional Business			129,246.75	13.3%	129,246.75	14.3%
Single-family dwellings displaced by commercial, office or industrial development	25,505.10	3.7%	25,505.10	2.6%	25,505.10	2.8%
TOTAL	696,178.38	100.0%	968,298.45	99.9%	902,306.35	99.9%

Source: Bucher, Willis and Ratliff Corporation

⁵ Assumes redevelopment of the park-and-ride on SR-522 only, since redevelopment of the 68th Avenue NE park-and-ride would occur as part of Downtown Concept B.

**TABLE ENV-D
OFFICE DEVELOPMENT BREAKDOWN**

LAND TYPE	ALTERNATIVE 1 SQUARE FEET	PERCENT OF TOTAL	ALTERNATIVE 2 SQUARE FEET	PERCENT OF TOTAL	PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE SQUARE FEET	PERCENT OF TOTAL
Vacant	15,238.80	2.4%	3,809.70	0.4%	3,809.70	0.5%
Single-family dwellings displaced by commercial, office or industrial development	8,831.20	1.4%	2,207.80	0.3%	2,207.80	0.3%
Downtown	383,616.20	61.2%	593,704.37	68.3%	527,712.27	65.7%
LakePointe	205,588.00	32.8%	205,588.00	23.6%	205,588.00	25.6%
Development of Industrial as Regional Business			60,766.20	7.0%	60,766.20	7.6%
Parcels greater than 1 acre and less than \$10,000 in improvement value	13,973.40	2.2%	3,493.35	0.4%	3,493.35	0.4%
TOTAL	627,247.6	100.0%	869,569.42	100.0%	803,577.32	100.1%

Source: Bucher, Willis and Ratliff Corporation

- **Indirect Impacts.** This section addresses the potential for potential rezone requests as a result of implementing any Alternative. For any Alternative examined, some property owners may seek rezones of less intensively zoned areas due to nearby more intensively zoned areas, or due to perceptions that the properties are similarly situated in terms of development potential, or environmental constraints. Areas that may particularly be subject to rezone requests are areas immediately adjacent to the proposed Downtown concept areas. For instance, additional mixed-use development in Concept Area B may promote requests for changes from the R-12 to higher density multi-family classifications, or to Office on property located along NE 181st Street. Under Alternative 1 or 2, mobile home parks near Concept C area could request higher density multi-family classifications. For any Alternative, the land use estimates prepared for this EIS assume that areas west of Downtown Concept B will not reclassify to categories that would significantly change the potential traffic generation of the planned R-12 classification. For Alternative 2, in the area east of Downtown Concept C, the EIS land use estimates assume that there will be a reclassification of properties designated R-12 (mobile home parks) to either R-24 or to RB. The Preferred Alternative reclassifies the two mobile home parks on NE 175th to R-24, and this was assumed the development estimates.
- **Impacts to Adjacent Jurisdictions.** Generally, in the northwest quadrant of the City, reclassifications along the City limits are not proposed for any alternative, with the only difference being the reclassification of the Tolt Pipeline to Public and Private Institution in the Preferred Alternative. Generally, low density single-family classifications lie adjacent to single-family development in the City of Lake Forest Park.

In the northeast quadrant within the City limits, Alternatives 1 and 2 do not reclassify properties along the border with King County/Bothell. Single-family uses are planned in this area and would correspond to single-family uses in the unincorporated area/City of Bothell. The Preferred Alternative would reclassify A-35 agricultural lands to the Public and Private Institution classification, which recognizes that the farm's development rights have been purchased, and it is a privately held open space use. Otherwise, the Preferred Alternative plans single-family uses corresponding to single-family uses in the unincorporated area/City of Bothell.

Alternatives 1 and 2 basically maintain King County classifications for the Joint Study Areas, with Alternative 2 making one change, classifying the Burke-Gilman Trail as a Public and Private Institution designation. The Preferred Alternative also maintains King County classifications for the Joint Study Areas, except for a King County Library District parcel in the Kenmore-Kirkland Joint Study Area, and the Burke-Gilman Trail in the Kenmore-Bothell Joint Study Area which would be reclassified to the Public and Private Institution designation.

Mitigation

- Goal 1 of the Comprehensive Plan is to "Enhance Kenmore's quality of life as a place to live, raise children, recreate, work, and shop."

Objective 1.3 and associated policies would "maintain and enhance the character of existing single-family neighborhoods by allowing compatible housing, improving infrastructure, and establishing appropriate site development standards."

- Goal 2 is to "Provide for orderly development."

Objective 2.1: "Implement the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map."

Policy LU-2.1.3 and Policy LU-2.1.4 direct under what circumstances reclassifications to multi-family and commercial classifications should be made.

Policy LU-2.1.5 states that the City will consider proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendments each calendar year concurrently so that the cumulative effect of the proposals can be determined.

Objective 2.6 and associated policies “require adequate transitions between land uses of differing intensities and between development and environmentally sensitive areas.”

- Goal 7 is to “Preserve and enhance Kenmore’s small-town feeling.”

Objective 7.2 and associated policies states that the City should “maintain smaller-scale development in residential neighborhoods.”

Objective 7.3 indicates that the City should “seek to integrate large-scale development that protects environmental quality, and enhances the community’s quality of life.”

- Goal 8 is to “Create attractive, functional, and enduring buildings and places.”

Objective 8.1 is to “Create a sense of place and identity for Kenmore while allowing for diversity.”

Policies LU-8.1.1 through LU-8.1.3 promote development quality, signage standards, and design review for commercial, multi-family and mixed-use developments wherever located in the City.

- Goal 9 is to “Promote compatible development in residential neighborhoods.”

Objective 9.1 indicates the City should “prepare and implement development standards and regulations that acknowledge neighborhood character.”

Objective 9.2 would “ensure that new housing is compatible with surrounding development in scale and/or design, and provides adequate on-site parking.”

- Goal 10 is to “Provide for environmental quality, open space, and vegetation.”

Objective 10.2 would promote the integration of “landscaping into streetscapes and developments, and increase the biomass in the community.”

- Zoning Code and other development regulations provide for compatibility between adjacent differing uses through setbacks, height restrictions, and landscaping requirements.

Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

Over time, the implementation of the Alternatives could irreversibly commit vacant, partially developed, and redeveloped properties to additional or new single-family, multi-family, commercial, and office uses. The implementation of any Alternative could irreversibly displace industrial uses for commercial or mixed-use developments. Reductions in industrial uses could be greater for Alternative 2 or the Preferred Alternative than for Alternative 1.

Land Use Plans

Affected Environment

- Washington's Growth Management Act (GMA) requires preparation of a Comprehensive Plan addressing land use, housing, capital facilities, utilities, and transportation issues. Certain topics such as open space corridors and essential public facilities must also be considered within Plan Elements. Optionally, the City may choose to include subarea plans and/or other elements, such as conservation, solar energy, and recreation. GMA does not limit optional topics.
- The Central Puget Sound Hearings Board, which hears cases regarding compliance with the Growth Management Act, has found that as a general rule, 4 dwelling units per acre or more constitutes urban densities. Exceptions can be made for significant, environmentally sensitive areas.
- Vision 2020 is a regional land use and transportation strategy prepared by the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) addressing King, Kitsap, Pierce, and Snohomish Counties. The Vision 2020 plan is used as a basis for Multi-County Planning Policies for King, Kitsap, Pierce and Snohomish County. Multi-County Planning Policies are required for the King, Pierce, and Snohomish Counties in RCW Section 36.70A.210. Vision 2020 creates a hierarchy of "centers" including metropolitan, subregional, centers, activity centers, pedestrian pockets, and small towns. The Kenmore area is proposed as a Candidate Activity Cluster.
- In accordance with the Growth Management Act, King County Countywide Planning Policies were adopted in 1994. The Countywide Planning Policies address critical areas, land use patterns, transportation, community character and open space, affordable housing, orderly development and provision of urban services, essential public facilities, economic development, and regional finance and governance. Municipal and county comprehensive plans should be consistent with the Countywide Planning Policies.
- The Northshore Utility District has prepared its 2000 Water System Comprehensive Plan and its 2000 Wastewater System Comprehensive Plan to meet State Department of Health, State Department of Ecology, and Growth Management Act Requirements. The plans indicate needed capital improvements or programs to meet growth in the next 20 years.
- The Kenmore Vision Statement was prepared by the Planning Commission in January 2000 in response to visioning workshops and a community survey. The City Council endorsed the Vision Statement in March 2000. The Vision Statement is to guide the Kenmore Comprehensive Plan.

Impacts

This section reviews consistency of the Alternatives with the GMA goals, King County Countywide Planning Policies, adjacent jurisdiction plans, and the Kenmore Vision Statement.

- **Growth Management Act Goals.** Any of the Alternatives meet GMA goals, although there are variations in some approaches. Alternative 2 or the Preferred Alternative would emphasize protection of single-family areas more than Alternative 1; however, there would still be opportunities for mixed-use and multi-family development in central Kenmore and along major arterials. Alternative 2 or the Preferred Alternative would also emphasize greater communication with citizens, businesses, and property owners regarding the City's development of programs, policies, regulations, and permit process management.

**TABLE ENV-E
GROWTH MANAGEMENT ACT COMPLIANCE**

ALTERNATIVE 1	ALTERNATIVE 2	PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
GMA Goal (1) Urban growth. Encourage development in urban areas where adequate public facilities and services exist or can be provided in an efficient manner.		
Alternative 1 concentrates most of its growth in the existing developed area of Kenmore as well as along transportation corridors. Public services and facilities exist in most parts of the City, particularly along the major corridors and in Downtown. (See Figure LU-3A of the Draft Integrated Comprehensive Plan and EIS. Also refer to King County Livable Urban Communities Chapter, Land Use section in the King County Comprehensive Plan .)	Alternative 2 concentrates most of its growth in the existing developed area of Kenmore as well as along transportation corridors. Public services and facilities exist in most parts of the City, particularly along the major corridors and in Downtown. (See Figure LU-3B and the Land Use Sub-Element in the Draft Integrated Comprehensive Plan and EIS.)	The Preferred Alternative also concentrates most of its growth in the existing developed area of Kenmore as well as along transportation corridors. Public services and facilities exist in most parts of the City, particularly along the major corridors and in Downtown. (See Figure LU-3 and the Land Use Sub-Element of this Final Integrated Comprehensive Plan and EIS.)
GMA Goal (2) Reduce sprawl. Reduce the inappropriate conversion of undeveloped land into sprawling, low-density development.		
The community is largely developed, and is fully located in the Urban Growth Boundary. Vacant property tends to be located in northeast Kenmore, and is designated for future single-family development. However, most of Kenmore's future growth will occur as commercial or mixed-use redevelopment, or as single-family dwellings added to partially developed properties. A plan policy is to maintain an average zoning density of 7-8 dwelling units per acre overall. (Policy U-502; also refer to the King County Comprehensive Plan Livable Urban Communities, Land Use and Housing sections.)	The community is largely developed, and is fully located in the Urban Growth Boundary. Vacant property tends to be located in northeast Kenmore, and is designated for future single-family development. However, most of Kenmore's future growth will occur as commercial or mixed-use redevelopment, or as single-family dwellings added to partially developed properties. A plan policy is to maintain an average zoning density of 7 dwelling units per acre overall. (Draft Policy LU-2.3.1; also refer to Draft Land Use Sub-Element, and Housing Element.)	The community is largely developed, and is fully located in the Urban Growth Boundary. Vacant property tends to be located in northeast Kenmore, and is designated for future single-family development. However, most of Kenmore's future growth will occur as commercial or mixed-use redevelopment, or as single-family dwellings added to partially developed properties. A plan policy is to maintain an average zoning density of 7 dwelling units per acre overall. (Final Policy LU-2.3.1; also refer to the Final Land Use Sub-Element, and Housing Element .)
GMA Goal (3) Transportation. Encourage efficient multimodal transportation systems that are based on regional priorities and coordinated with county and city comprehensive plans.		
Policies support alternate modes of travel. There is an emphasis on transit improvements as well as capital improvements. Improvements are to be in place to support growth at the time of or within 6 years of development. Policies and implementing regulations allow public and private streets. Refer to the King County Comprehensive Plan Transportation Chapter.	Policies support alternate modes of travel. There is an emphasis on transit improvements as well as capital improvements. Improvements are to be in place to support growth at time of or within 6 years of development. Additionally, the policies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on support of Downtown, and a local circulator system. • Change functional classifications for some roads. • Emphasize completing a pedestrian/nonmotorized transportation network. • Minimize use of local access tracts in favor of minor access streets to minimize impacts to 	The policies in the Preferred Alternative are similar to Alternative 2, with the following additional refinements not listed under Alternative 2: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creation of two sub-elements, particularly to emphasize transit and alternative modes: Transportation Facility, Level of Service, and Funding Sub-Element and Transit and Alternative Mode Sub-Element. • Elimination of proposed 83rd Place NE extension (bridge) option. • Identification of potential alternative emergency vehicle routes in areas with severe

ALTERNATIVE 1	ALTERNATIVE 2	PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
	<p>neighborhood character and to achieve a more regular street pattern.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Require new streets to be publicly dedicated, encourage existing private streets to be maintained consistently, and encourage ultimate inclusion of private streets into the public street system. Establish sidewalk priorities for arterial and local streets. Address the continued operation of the Air Harbor, and ways to minimize conflicts. <p>Refer to the Draft Transportation Element.</p>	<p>routes in areas with severe congestion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognition and encouragement of potential regional ferry services on Lake Washington. Emphasis on maintaining HOV lanes for transit only. Additional emphasis on multi-agency coordination regarding SR-522. Encouragement to study signal timing with WSDOT, particularly at SR-522 and 68th Avenue NE. <p>Refer to the Final Transportation Element.</p>
GMA Goal (4) Housing. Encourage the availability of affordable housing to all economic segments of the population of this state, promote a variety of residential densities and housing types, and encourage preservation of existing housing stock.		
<p>Alternative 1 provides for low, medium, and high density land use categories. It includes policies encouraging preservation of the existing housing stock. Affordable housing targets are included.</p> <p>Other policies include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A range of single-family and multi-family densities, with minimum densities in zones with 4 or more units. (However, there is a conflict between the policies and the Interim Zoning Code that does not apply minimum density requirements in the R-4, R-6, and R-8 zones.) Encouragement of mixed-uses in commercial and office areas. Density bonuses offered in residential (more than 4 units), commercial and office zones. Density bonuses encouraged for affordable housing, energy conservation, historic preservation and parks/open space. Encouragement of attached and detached housing in single-family areas. Promotion of scattered site multi-family where possible. Establishment of County housing programs, and coordination with State and Federal agencies to facilitate affordable housing. Mobile home parks encouraged to be retained. 	<p>Alternative 2 provides for low, medium, and high density land use categories. It includes policies encouraging preservation of the existing housing stock. Affordable housing targets are included.</p> <p>Other policies include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A range of single-family and multi-family densities. Minimum density applied zones with 12 or more units. Other policies requiring an average zoning density of 7 du/ac, housing targets, affordable housing targets, and annual monitoring of the plan should result in sufficient densities being achieved in zones with less than 12 units per acre. Encouragement of mixed-uses in commercial and office areas, with particular attention to Downtown. Density bonuses offered in residential, commercial and office zones. Density bonuses encouraged for affordable housing, additional pervious surface, parks/open space. In Downtown density bonuses for shared/ structured parking and for lot consolidation. Added a density bonus in R-1 that may only be transferred offsite. Downtown identified as density receiving area for offsite density transfers. Single-family predominance in single-family zones. 	<p>The policies in the Preferred Alternative are similar to Alternative 2, with the following additional refinements not listed under Alternative 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promotion of Uniform Building Code review to determine measures to achieve desired densities (e.g. allowing more floors of wood frame construction). Identification of the need to conduct a detailed stream and wetland inventory and delineation in Swamp Creek area, and to fully consider appropriate uses, densities, and incentives to achieve environmental protection, a networked open space and trail system, and development consistent with desired neighborhood character. Creation of two sub-elements to emphasize important policies: Residential Neighborhoods and Affordable Housing Sub-Elements. Clarification that housing for persons with special needs can apply to any income level. <p>Refer to the Final Land Use and Housing Elements in this document.</p>

ALTERNATIVE 1	ALTERNATIVE 2	PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
Refer to the <u>King County Comprehensive Plan</u> Livable Urban Communities Chapter, Land Use, and Housing sections.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concentration of multi-family in Downtown or along arterials. Mobile home parks may be retained, but due to economic life of mobile homes, potential conversion may occur. Promotion of programs to help fund relocation into nearby affordable housing. Support for County programs, and coordination with State and Federal agencies to facilitate affordable housing. Also, identification of local role in promoting housing for all economic segments of the community. <p>Refer to the Draft Land Use and Housing Elements.</p>	
GMA Goal (5) Economic development. Encourage economic development throughout the state that is consistent with adopted comprehensive plans, promote economic opportunity for all citizens of this state, especially for unemployed and for disadvantaged persons, and encourage growth in areas experiencing insufficient economic growth, all within the capacities of the state's natural resources, public services, and public facilities.		
Policies promote economic vitality and opportunity for all. The environment is considered an economic value. Services and infrastructure are to support economic policies. Policies support a regional economic strategy. Policies promote public/private partnerships. Policies promote retention and expansion of industries, firms and jobs within manufacturing and industrial areas. See the <u>King County Comprehensive Plan</u> Livable Urban Communities Chapter, Economic Development section.	Policies promote economic vitality and opportunity for all. The environment is considered an economic value. Services and infrastructure are to support economic policies. Policies support coordination with other jurisdictions, and agencies in regional economic strategies. Policies promote public/private partnerships. Strategies include encouragement of mixed-uses in commercial and office areas, with particular attention to Downtown. Plan promotes a mix of uses in Downtown whereby civic investment can spur private redevelopment. The plan supports industrial uses being retained until conversion to commercial use due to market changes. Refer to the Draft Land Use and Economic Development Sub-Elements.	Same as Alternative 2. Refer to the Final Land Use and Economic Development Sub-Elements in this document.
GMA Goal (6) Property rights. Private property shall not be taken for public use without just compensation having been made. The property rights of landowners shall be protected from arbitrary and discriminatory actions.		
Policies direct that implementing regulations should be fair, and offer relief in certain circumstances. (Refer to Policy I-401 in the <u>King County Comprehensive Plan</u> Implementation Chapter)	Policies direct that implementing regulations should be fair, offer relief in certain circumstances, and provide for reasonable use of property (see Policy LU-2.2.3). Also, policies encourage a balance between public shoreline access and privacy of adjacent properties. Refer to the Draft Land Use and Shoreline Sub-Elements and the Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Element.	Preferred Alternative policies are similar to Alternative 2. Refer to the Final Land Use and Shoreline Sub-Elements and the Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Element in this document.

ALTERNATIVE 1	ALTERNATIVE 2	PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
GMA Goal (7) Permits. Applications for both state and local government permits should be processed in a timely and fair manner to ensure predictability.		
Policies support expeditious, predictable, and responsive land use regulations. The process is to offer effective public notice. (See Policy I-401 in the <u>King County Comprehensive Plan</u> Implementation Chapter)	Policies support expeditious, predictable, and responsive land use regulations. The process is to offer effective public notice. Policies support strengthening communication with citizens, business owners, property owners, and others. Also, there are commitments to support timely, predictable and fair permit processes, as well as public involvement. See Policy LU-2.2.3, and Objectives 44.1 and 45.3 plus associated policies in the Draft Land Use and Public Services Elements.	Preferred Alternative policies are similar to Alternative 2. See Policy LU-2.2.3, and Objectives 43.1 and 44.3 plus associated policies in the Final Land Use and Public Services Elements of this document.
GMA Goal (8) Natural resource industries. Maintain and enhance natural resource-based industries, including productive timber, agricultural, and fisheries industries. Encourage the conservation of productive forest lands and productive agricultural lands, and discourage incompatible uses.		
Plan addresses agriculture, forestry, and mineral resources in the <u>King County Comprehensive Plan</u> Rural Legacy and Natural Resource Lands Chapter.	Kenmore does not contain natural resource industries. The plan acknowledges a small amount of agricultural property in east Kenmore (where development rights have been purchased) with very low-density zoning. Also, the plan does support methods for open space retention. Refer to the Draft Land Use Sub-Element, and Parks, Recreation and Open Space Element.	Kenmore does not contain natural resource industries. The plan reclassifies a small amount of agricultural property in east Kenmore (where development rights have been purchased) with Public and Private Institution Zoning which would accommodate the use. Also, the plan does support methods for open space retention. Refer to the Final Land Use Sub-Element, and Parks, Recreation and Open Space Element .
GMA Goal (9) Open space and recreation. Encourage the retention of open space and development of recreational opportunities, conserve fish and wildlife habitat, increase access to natural resource lands and water, and develop parks.		
Policies emphasize regional park system. Policies promote the protection of critical areas. Refer to the Natural Environment, and Parks, Open Space and Recreation Sections of Chapters 4 and 5 in the <u>King County Comprehensive Plan</u> .	Policies address local park and recreation services, with maintenance and acquisition priorities. Policies encourage coordination and partnerships with local and regional park and recreation providers. Policies promote the protection of critical areas. Refer to the Draft Natural Environment Sub-Element and Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Element.	Same as Alternative 2 with the following refinements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promotion of concept to identify and consider regional and local views for pedestrians and drivers. Identification of important view corridors to Lake Washington and the Sammamish River, and methods to retain and enhance them (based in part on the Draft EIS recommendations). Selection of an Interim Level of Service Standard for Local Parks, 2 acres per 1,000 population. Refer to the Final Natural Environment Sub-Element and Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Element in this document.
GMA Goal (10) Environment. Protect the environment and enhance the state's high quality of life, including air and water quality, and the availability of water.		
Policies address protection of air and water quality as well as water supply.	Policies address protection of air and water quality as well as water supply.	Same as Alternative 2 with the following refinements:

ALTERNATIVE 1	ALTERNATIVE 2	PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
Refer to the <u>King County Comprehensive Plan</u> Natural Environment and Facilities and Services Chapters.	Policies also address noise and light and glare. Refer to the Draft Natural Environment Sub-Element and the Surface Water, Transportation, and Utilities Elements.	<p>following refinements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of noise-impact areas and noise mitigation options (based on Draft EIS) • Strengthening enforcement of wetland alteration violations • Clarification of fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas in Kenmore, and recommendation to conduct a local process to identify fish, wildlife, and plant species of local importance • More emphasis on the City's response to Federal 4(d) rules. <p>Refer to the Final Natural Environment Sub-Element and the Surface Water, Transportation, and Utilities Elements in this document.</p>
GMA Goal (11) Citizen participation and coordination. Encourage the involvement of citizens in the planning process and ensure coordination between communities and jurisdictions to reconcile conflicts.		
See discussion under Permits. Regarding coordination with other agencies, the plan supports coordination with special districts, service providers, adjacent jurisdictions, and State and Federal agencies regarding utilities, transportation, land use planning, etc. For example, see U-402, V-303, V-304, V-306, F-204, F-213, F-306, F-321, and others in the <u>King County Comprehensive Plan</u> .	See discussion under Permits. Regarding coordination with other agencies, the plan supports coordination with special districts, service providers, adjacent jurisdictions, and State and Federal agencies regarding utilities, transportation, land use planning, etc. For example, see Draft Objectives 2.4, 2.8, 2.9, 36.1, 36.2, 46.2, 46.3, 47.1, 47.2, 47.3, 48.1, 48.2, 48.4, 49.1, 49.2, 49.3, 50.1, 51.1, 51.2, 51.3 and associated policies.	See discussion under Permits. Regarding coordination with other agencies, the plan supports coordination with special districts, service providers, adjacent jurisdictions, and State and Federal agencies regarding utilities, transportation, land use planning, etc. For example, see Final Objectives 2.4, 2.7, 2.8, 32.1, 32.2, 45.2, 45.3, 46.1, 46.2, 46.3, 47.1, 47.2, 47.3, 48.1, 49.1, 50.1, 50.2, 50.3 and associated policies.
GMA Goal (12) Public facilities and services. Ensure that those public facilities and services necessary to support development shall be adequate to serve the development at the time the development is available for occupancy and use without decreasing current service levels below locally established minimum standards.		
The <u>King County Comprehensive Plan</u> includes a Capital Facilities Chapter, as well as policies in the Land Use, Transportation, and Facilities/Utilities Chapters that promote infrastructure concurrent with growth.	Plan includes a Capital Facilities Element (in progress), as well as policies in the Draft Land Use, Transportation, and Utilities Elements that promote infrastructure concurrent with growth.	Plan includes a Final Capital Facilities Element , as well as policies in the Land Use, Transportation, and Utilities Elements that promote infrastructure concurrent with growth.
GMA Goal (13) Historic preservation. Identify and encourage the preservation of lands, sites, and structures, that have historical or archaeological significance.		
Policies support the identification and preservation of historic resources. Plan promotes cultural arts programs and activities. For example, see policies CR-201, CR-202, CR203, CR-206, CR-303, CR-404 and others in the <u>King County Comprehensive Plan</u> .	Policies support the identification and preservation of historic resources. Plan promotes cultural arts programs and activities. For example, see Objectives 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3, and associated policies in the Draft Land Use Element. Also see Objective 8.2 and associated policies in the Draft Community Design Sub-element.	Policies support the identification and preservation of historic resources. Plan promotes cultural arts programs and activities. For example, see Objectives 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3, and associated policies in the Final Land Use Element .

Sources: RCW 36.70A and Bucher, Willis and Ratliff Corporation

- **Vision 2020.** Alternative 1 designates Kenmore as an Activity Center where mixed-use development and transit improvements will occur (refer to Policy U-602, for example). This designation would be similar to the Vision 2020 Activity Cluster. Alternative 2 or the Preferred Alternative, in policy LU-4.1.2, also designates Downtown Kenmore as an Activity Cluster, consistent with Vision 2020. The policy indicates that the Activity Cluster is an area with an array of land uses having sufficient densities and intensities to encourage transit and non-motorized transportation. Under any Alternative, minimum densities are promoted in the Downtown area.
- **Countywide Planning Policies.** With the exception of the minimum housing density policy that is to apply to all residential zones, Alternative 2 or the Preferred Alternative meet the King County Countywide Planning Policies. Alternative 2 or the Preferred Alternative would require minimum densities in zones with 12 or more units per acre. Other Alternative 2 or Preferred Alternative policies require an average zoning density of 7 dwelling units per acre, meeting housing targets, meeting affordable housing targets, and require annual monitoring of the plan. These policies should result in sufficient densities being achieved in zones with less than 12 units per acre.

TABLE ENV-F
COUNTYWIDE PLANNING POLICY (CPP) COMPLIANCE

ALTERNATIVE 1	ALTERNATIVE 2	PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
CRITICAL AREAS		
Wetlands, Fish and Wildlife. The CPPs address wetland protection and fish and wildlife habitat. The wetland policies set guidelines for the use of wetland delineation manuals, use of a single Countywide wetland classification system, regulatory and non-regulatory wetland protection mechanisms, and wetland mitigation. Fish and wildlife policies address protection of habitat networks and identification of the networks in a Comprehensive Plan, identification of critical fish and wildlife habitat, maintenance/enhancement of natural drainage system, maintenance/enhancement of water quality, and jurisdictional coordination regarding land use planning and habitat management.		
<p>Policies address wetland protection, delineation, and classification. For example, see policies NE-314 to NE-329.</p> <p>The <u>King County Comprehensive Plan</u> Natural Environment Chapter identifies fish and wildlife habitat, including streams, lakes, and wetlands.</p> <p>Policies address coordination with state agencies and federally recognized tribes. For example, see King County Policy NE-609.</p>	<p>Policies address wetland protection, delineation, and classification. For example, see Draft Objective 16.1 and associated policies.</p> <p>The Draft Natural Environment Sub-Element identifies fish and wildlife habitat, including streams, lakes, and wetlands. Policies are primarily associated with Draft Objective 16.3.</p> <p>Policies address coordination with state agencies and federally recognized tribes. For example, see Draft Policy LU-16.3.10.</p>	<p>Policies address wetland protection, delineation, and classification. For example, see Objective 15.1 and associated policies. A new policy has been added to this Objective regarding penalties for wetland violations.</p> <p>The Final Natural Environment Sub-Element identifies fish and wildlife habitat, including streams, lakes, and wetlands. Policies are primarily associated with Objective 15.3. Policies have been clarified regarding fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas in Kenmore, and recommendations added to conduct a local process to identify fish, wildlife, and plant species of local importance</p> <p>Policies address coordination with state agencies and federally recognized tribes. For example, see Policy LU-15.3.10. In comparison with Alternative 2, policies strengthen wetland alteration enforcement, clarify fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas, and emphasize the City's response to Federal 4(d) rules.</p>

ALTERNATIVE 1	ALTERNATIVE 2	PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
Frequently Flooded Areas, Water Quality. CPPs require all jurisdictions to coordinate flood hazard reduction activities, maintain consistency with the King County <u>Flood Hazard Reduction Plan</u> , and prevent new development from causing adverse flooding, erosion, and natural resource impacts outside their boundaries. Policies also support implementation of the <u>Puget Sound Water Quality Management Plan</u> .		
Policies support a regional, cooperative approach to surface water management, implementation of the King County <u>Flood Hazard Reduction Plan</u> , and measures to improve water quality. For example, see <u>King County Comprehensive Plan</u> policies F-323, NE-330, NE-331 and others.	Policies support a regional, cooperative approach to surface water management, implementation of the King County <u>Flood Hazard Reduction Plan</u> (as well as other local plans), and measures to improve water quality. For example, see Draft Objectives 14.4, 15.1, 43.6 and 43.8 with associated policies	Policies support a regional, cooperative approach to surface water management, implementation of the King County <u>Flood Hazard Reduction Plan</u> (as well as other local plans), and measures to improve water quality. For example, see Final Objectives 13.4, 14.1, 42.1, 42.6 and 42.8 with associated policies
Geologic Hazard Areas. CPPs address geologic hazard areas and the need to protect public health, property, important ecological and hydrogeologic functions, and environmental quality, as well as the need to reduce public costs by regulating development. Regulations must address steep slopes, severe landslide hazard areas, erosion hazard areas, mine hazard areas, and seismic hazard areas. Regulations must address provisions for vegetation retention, seasonal clearing and grading limits, setbacks and drainage and erosion controls.		
The Alternative addresses geologic hazard areas in the <u>King County Comprehensive Plan</u> Natural Environment Chapter (for example, policies N-4, NR-9, NE-330, NE-331, NE-401, NE-402, NE-403, NE-404, NE-406 and others). Policies require limitation on development in landslide areas. In erosion hazard areas, policies direct minimization of disturbance, retention of vegetation, and higher surface water requirements. Seismic hazard area policies address application of Uniform Building Code and other design and construction measures to minimize liquefaction hazards.	The Alternative addresses geologic hazard areas in the Natural Environment Sub-Element and Surface Water Element (for example, Draft objectives 15.2, 15.3, 43.3 and associated policies). Policies require limitation on development in landslide areas. In erosion hazard areas, policies direct minimization of disturbance, retention of vegetation, and higher surface water requirements. Seismic hazard area policies address application of Uniform Building Code and other design and construction measures to minimize liquefaction hazards.	The Alternative addresses geologic hazard areas in the Final Natural Environment Sub-Element and Surface Water Element (for example, Final objectives 14.2, 14.3, 42.3 and associated policies). Policies require limitation on development in landslide areas. In erosion hazard areas, policies direct minimization of disturbance, retention of vegetation, and higher surface water requirements. Seismic hazard area policies address application of Uniform Building Code and other design and construction measures to minimize liquefaction hazards.
Air Quality. The CPPs address air quality by requiring coordination with PSAPCA and the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) in the development of policies, methodologies, and standards that promote regional air quality.		
Air quality policies address working with other agencies. Policies also address alternative modes of transportation, air quality impact analysis for plans and subarea plans, a reduction of emissions due to wood-burning stoves, particulates emitted during construction, reduction in pollutants that contribute to global warming, and others. See policies NE- 201 to NE-206 in the <u>King County Comprehensive Plan</u> Natural Environment Chapter.	Air quality policies address working with other agencies to monitor air quality and to educate the public. Policies also address alternative modes of transportation, air quality impact analysis for large developments, and a reduction of emissions during construction. See Objective 14.1 and associated policies in the Draft Natural Environment Sub-Element.	Air quality policies address working with other agencies to monitor air quality and to educate the public. Policies also address alternative modes of transportation, air quality impact analysis for large developments, and a reduction of emissions during construction. See Objective 13.1 and associated policies in the Final Natural Environment Sub-Element .
LAND USE PATTERNS		
Population/Housing. The Countywide population growth has been established by the State Office of Financial Management as required by the Growth Management Act. Each jurisdiction in King County has been allocated a housing target (population allocations were converted into households) for the year 2012 (population figures were provided to the Counties in 1992, divided and ratified by 1994). The household target range for Kenmore is 974 to 1,190, with the median being 1,082. The CPPs commit the City to ensuring there is capacity in the Comprehensive Plan and implementing regulations to meet this target. Growth would occur based upon market forces. The CPPs commit the City to ensuring there is capacity in the Comprehensive Plan and implementing regulations to meet this target. Growth would occur based upon market forces. However, the policies indicate that the City should		

ALTERNATIVE 1	ALTERNATIVE 2	PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
<p>promote affordable housing to low and very low income households, at 20-24 percent and 17 percent of the target respectively.</p> <p>Aside from establishing housing targets, the CPPs also include policies requiring jurisdictions to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluate existing affordable housing, subsidized or not, in terms of potential loss to redevelopment, deterioration, or plans and policies. Strategies to preserve housing or provide relocation assistance should be developed; Monitor residential development; Establish minimum densities, excluding critical areas, for new construction in each zone; Establish a target mix of housing types for new development. 		
<p>Alternative 1 provides for low, medium, and high density land use categories. It includes policies encouraging preservation of the existing housing stock. Affordable housing targets are included.</p> <p>Other policies include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Range of single-family and multi-family densities, with minimum densities in zones with 4 or more units. (However, there is a conflict between the policies and the Interim Zoning Code. The City's Interim Zoning Code does not apply minimum density requirements in the R-4, R-6 and R-8 zones.) Encouragement of mixed-uses in commercial and office areas. Density bonuses offered in residential (more than 4 units), commercial and office zones. Density bonuses encouraged for affordable housing, energy conservation, historic preservation and parks/open space. Encouragement of attached and detached housing in single-family areas. Promotion of scattered site multi-family where possible. Establishment of County housing programs, and coordination with State and Federal agencies to facilitate affordable housing. Retention of mobile home parks. <p>Refer to the King County Comprehensive Plan Livable Urban Communities Chapter, Land Use, and Housing sections.</p> <p>On an annualized basis, the 1992-2012 target would mean that 50 to 60 units would need to be provided each year within Kenmore. Assuming 60 households would require housing each year through the year 2020, the life of the plan, one could determine the maximum 1992-2020 household target to equal 1,680 households. By providing capacity for up to 5,708</p>	<p>Alternative 2 provides for low, medium, and high density land use categories. It includes policies encouraging preservation of the existing housing stock. Affordable housing targets are included.</p> <p>Other policies include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Range of single-family and multi-family densities. Minimum density applied in zones with 12 or more units. Other policies requiring an average zoning density of 7 du/ac, housing targets, affordable housing targets, and annual monitoring of the plan should result in sufficient densities being achieved in zones with less than 12 units per acre. Encouragement of mixed-uses in commercial and office areas, with particular attention to Downtown. Density bonuses offered in residential, commercial and office zones. Density bonuses encouraged for affordable housing, additional pervious surface, parks/open space. In Downtown density bonuses for shared/structured parking and for lot consolidation. Added a density bonus in R-1 which may only be transferred offsite. Downtown identified as density receiving area for offsite density transfers. Single-family predominance in single-family zones. Concentration of multi-family in Downtown or along arterials. Mobile home parks may be retained, but due to economic life of mobile homes, potential conversion may occur. Promotion of programs to help fund relocation into nearby affordable housing. Support for County programs, and coordination with State and Federal agencies to facilitate affordable housing. Also, identification of local role in 	<p>The Preferred Alternative is similar to Alternative 2 in terms of land use and housing policies.</p> <p>Refer to the Final Land Use and Housing Elements.</p> <p>On an annualized basis, the 1992-2012 target would mean that 50 to 60 units would need to be provided each year within Kenmore. Assuming 60 households would require housing each year through the year 2020, the life of the plan, one could determine the maximum 1992-2020 household target to equal 1,680 households. By providing capacity for up to 6,107 dwelling units, the Alternative would provide enough zoned capacity, and a more than sufficient market cushion, to exceed the 2012 and 2020 household target.</p>

ALTERNATIVE 1	ALTERNATIVE 2	PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
providing capacity for up to 5,708 dwelling units, the Alternative would provide enough zoned capacity, and a more than sufficient market cushion, to exceed the 2012 and 2020 household target.	<p>promoting housing for all economic segments of the community.</p> <p>Refer to the Draft Land Use and Housing Elements.</p> <p>On an annualized basis, the 1992-2012 target would mean that 50 to 60 units would need to be provided each year within Kenmore. Assuming 60 households would require housing each year through the year 2020, the life of the plan, one could determine the maximum 1992-2020 household target to equal 1,680 households. By providing capacity for up to 6,230 dwelling units, the Alternative would provide enough zoned capacity, and a more than sufficient market cushion, to exceed the 2012 and 2020 household target.</p>	
<p>Land Use. The CPPs define an Urban Growth Boundary within which urban development should occur. The City of Kenmore is included within the Urban Growth Boundary. Residential, commercial, and industrial development should occur in an urban context and be sufficiently dense to efficiently support urban services.</p> <p>The policies also establish an Urban Centers concept including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urban Centers • Manufacturing/Industrial Centers • Activity Areas: These areas contain moderate concentrations of commercial and housing development that function as focal points for the local community. There are no numeric criteria, but qualitative criteria include ensuring there is an array of land uses; sufficient densities/intensities that encourage transit; pedestrian emphasis, and disincentives for single-occupancy vehicle usage during peak hours. Activity areas are designated in local comprehensive plans and not in the Countywide Planning Policies. • Growth outside of Centers, but within the Urban Growth Boundary: Policies address establishing minimum residential densities in each residential zone; establishing new household targets and new employment targets. Housing targets are addressed above. An employment allocation has not been given to Kenmore. Kenmore's employment targets will be set in the Comprehensive Plan. They would theoretically be deducted from the Unincorporated King County employment targets established before Kenmore incorporated. The Unincorporated King County number is 25,000 new employment by 2012. • Urban Separators: These are low density areas or areas of little development within the Urban Growth Boundary which protect adjacent resource lands, rural areas, and/or environmentally sensitive areas, or which create open space corridors between urban areas. <p>The policies indicate that growth should be directed first to Centers and urbanized areas with existing infrastructure capacity, second to areas which are already urbanized such that infrastructure improvements can be easily extended, and last to areas requiring major infrastructure improvements.</p>		
<p>The alternative identifies Kenmore as an Activity Center.</p> <p>The employment square footages in Table ES-C, would support net increases in employees of 4,255 for Alternative 1 (without deductions for the loss of industrial uses) by the year 2020. On an annualized basis through 2012, Kenmore would add 2,553 employees for Alternative 1. If deducted from the Unincorporated King County employment target, the County's employment target would equal 22,447.</p>	<p>The alternative identifies Downtown Kenmore as an Activity Area per the Countywide Planning Policies, and an Activity Cluster per Vision 2020. See Draft policy LU-4.1.2.</p> <p>The employment square footages in Table ES-C, would support net increases in employees of 5,910 for Alternative 2 (without deductions for the loss of industrial uses) by the year 2020. On an annualized basis through 2012, Kenmore would add 3,546 employees for Alternative 2. If deducted from the Unincorporated King County employment target, the County's employment target would</p>	<p>The Preferred Alternative identifies Downtown Kenmore as an Activity Area per the Countywide Planning Policies, and an Activity Cluster per Vision 2020. See Final policy LU-4.1.2.</p> <p>The employment square footages in Table ES-C, would support net increases in employees of 5,485 for the Preferred Alternative (without deductions for the loss of industrial uses) by the year 2020. On an annualized basis through 2012, Kenmore would add 3,291 employees for the Preferred Alternative. If deducted from the Unincorporated</p>

ALTERNATIVE 1	ALTERNATIVE 2	PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
	equal 21,454.	King County employment target, the County's employment target would equal 21,709.
<p>Transportation. Policies as stated in the CPPs are directed at providing a balanced transportation system using all modes of transportation (e.g., automobiles, heavy vehicles, transit, bicycle, pedestrian equestrian, air travel, etc.) as efficiently as possible. Impacts to individual cities related to the movement of people and goods generated by State, County, and/or neighboring jurisdictions must be taken into account. Coordination should be used when planning and financing projects to ensure state, region, county and city vision, and land use plans.</p> <p>Future improvement needs for all modes should be considered and included in the Plan with special interest in completing the regional systems. Additionally, Level of Service calculations should be consistent to aid in determining accountability and impacts of projects. Mode-split goals for each mode of transportation should be determined to ensure services are adequate.</p> <p>Timelines for all improvements are to be included, focusing on maintenance and preservation of existing infrastructure with additions as necessary to accommodate future growth. Further, when funding falls short of projected need, alternative funding sources should be sought including developer costs, impact fees, LID's, etc.</p>		
Policies support alternate modes of travel. There is an emphasis on transit improvements as well as capital improvements. Improvements are to be in place to support growth at time of or within six years of development. Policies address coordination with other agencies, such as Policies T-107, T-510, T-514, T-529, T-539, T-543, and others. See Chapter 9, Transportation of the King County Comprehensive Plan .	Policies support alternate modes of travel. There is an emphasis on transit improvements as well as capital improvements. Improvements are to be in place to support growth at time of or within six years of development. Policies address coordination with other agencies (e.g. Draft Objectives 36.1, 36.2, and 36.3 and associated policies). At the time of this writing, the City has adopted King County levels of service on an interim basis. Future levels of service policies were developed with the Draft Comprehensive Plan.	Policies support alternate modes of travel. There is an emphasis on transit improvements as well as capital improvements. Improvements are to be in place to support growth at time of or within six years of development. Policies address coordination with other agencies (e.g. Final Objectives 32.1, 32.2, and 32.3 and associated policies). Currently, the City has adopted King County levels of service on an interim basis. Future levels of service policies are being adopted with this Final Comprehensive Plan.
COMMUNITY CHARACTER AND OPEN SPACE		
<p>Historic Resources. The CPPs promote working individually and cooperatively to “identify, evaluate, and protect historic resources including continued and consistent protection for historic resources and public art works.” Also, the policies encourage jurisdictions to provide “land use patterns and implement regulations that protect and enhance historic resources, and sustain historic community character.”</p>		
Policies support the identification and preservation of historic resources. Plan promotes cultural arts programs and activities. For example, see policies CR-201, CR-202, CR203, CR-206, CR-303, CR-404 and others in the King County Comprehensive Plan .	Policies support the identification and preservation of historic resources. Plan promotes cultural arts programs and activities. For example, see Objectives 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3. and associated policies in the Draft Land Use Element. Also see Objective 8.2 and associated policies in the Draft Community Design Sub-element.	Policies support the identification and preservation of historic resources. Plan promotes cultural arts programs and activities. For example, see Objectives 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3, and associated policies in the Final Land Use Element .
<p>Urban Design. CPPs require jurisdictions to promote high quality design and site planning in public and private developments.</p>		
Policies address design characteristics in the Kenmore activity center. For example, see policies CI-4, K-12 and U-608 in the King County Comprehensive Plan .	Policies address design characteristics in Downtown, and along major commercial corridors such as NE Bothell Way. Sample policies include: Draft Land Use Element: Goal 1, Objective 1.2 and Policy LU-1.2.1; Policies LU-2.1.3, LU-2.1.4, and LU-2.3.4. Draft Downtown Sub-Element Goal 4, Objectives 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5 and associated Policies	Policies address design characteristics in Downtown, and along major commercial corridors such as NE Bothell Way. Sample policies include: Final Land Use Element: Policies LU-2.1.3, LU-2.1.4, and LU-2.3.4. Final Downtown Sub-Element Goal 4, Objectives 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5 and associated Policies Goal 5, Objectives 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, 5.5 and associated Policies

ALTERNATIVE 1	ALTERNATIVE 2	PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
	<p>Goal 5, Objectives 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, 5.5 and associated Policies</p> <p>Objectives 6.1, 6.2, 6.3 and associated Policies</p> <p>Draft Community Design Sub-Element: Objective 8.4 and Policy LU-8.4.1; Objective 12.1 and Policy LU-12.1.1; Objective 12.2 and Policy LU-12.2.1; Objective 12.3 and associated Policies</p> <p>Draft Economic Development Sub-Element : Objective 25.5 and associated Policies</p>	<p>Objectives 6.1, 6.2, 6.3 and associated Policies</p> <p>Final Community Design Sub-Element: Objective 8.3 and Policy LU-8.3.1; Objective 12.1 and Policy LU-12.1.1; Objective 12.2 and associated Policies</p> <p>Final Economic Development Sub-Element : Objective 25.5 and associated Policies</p>
<p>Human and Community Services. Applicable policies indicate that Human and Community Service planning activities should support CPPs and the Countywide land development pattern, and that all jurisdictions should identify essential community and human services and include them in land use, capital improvement and transportation plans.</p>		
Human and community services are addressed in various King County Chapters addressing urban growth, economic development, and housing. For example, see King County policies V-302, ED-301, H-209, and others.	Human and community services are addressed in the Draft Public Services Element, particularly in Goal 48 and associated objectives and policies.	Human and community services are addressed in the Public Services Element , particularly in Goal 47 and associated objectives and policies.
<p>Parks and Open Space. The CPPs require the identification and protection of local open spaces in individual Comprehensive Plans. Included as well is a statement that Countywide funding shall be available for the acquisition, maintenance, and stewardship of parks and open space.</p>		
Policies emphasize regional park system. Policies promote the protection of critical areas. Refer to the Natural Environment, and Parks, Open Space and Recreation Sections of Chapters 4 and 5 in the <u>King County Comprehensive Plan</u> .	Policies address local park and recreation services, with maintenance and acquisition priorities. Policies encourage coordination and partnerships with local and regional park and recreation providers. Policies promote the protection of critical areas. Refer to the Draft Natural Environment Sub-Element and Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Element.	<p>Policies are similar to Alternative 2, with the following additional refinements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promotion of concept to identify and consider regional and local views for pedestrians and drivers Identification of important view corridors to Lake Washington and the Sammamish River, and methods to retain and enhance them (based in part on the Draft EIS recommendations) Selection of an Interim Level of Service Standard for Local Parks, 2 acres per 1,000 population <p>Refer to the Final Natural Environment Sub-Element and Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Element.</p>
<p>ORDERLY DEVELOPMENT, SERVICES</p>		
<p>Orderly Development, Services. The policies address regional coordination of water supplies, water conservation, alternate sewer treatment technologies and systems, and preference for urban water and sewer systems to serve new construction in the areas identified for growth within 10 years.</p>		
The Alternative is consistent with the Countywide policies regarding regional coordination, and services available for new construction. See for example, policies F-213, F-306, F-309, and U-521 in the <u>King County Comprehensive Plan</u> .	The Alternative is consistent with the Countywide policies regarding regional coordination, and services available for new construction. For example, see Policy LU-10.2.1, and Objectives 49.1, and 49.2 and associated policies in the Draft Land Use and Utilities Elements.	The Alternative is consistent with the Countywide policies regarding regional coordination, and services available for new construction. For example, see Policy LU-2.4.5, and Objective 48.1 and associated policies in the Final Land Use and Utilities Elements .

ALTERNATIVE 1	ALTERNATIVE 2	PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
SITING PUBLIC CAPITAL FACILITIES OF A COUNTYWIDE OR STATEWIDE NATURE		
Siting Public Capital Facilities of a Countywide or Statewide Nature. CPPs have a special set of policies regarding siting public capital facilities of a Countywide or Statewide nature. The facilities must be planned and sited through an inter-jurisdictional process to be established.		
Essential public facilities are addressed in policies F-220 to F-222 and others in the <u>King County Comprehensive Plan</u> .	Essential public facilities are addressed in the Draft Essential Public Facilities Sub-Element.	Essential public facilities are addressed in the Final Capital Facilities Element , Goal 60.
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT		
Economic Development. CPPs address economic sustainability, regional economic development strategies, diversification of the economy, environmental protection, economically disadvantaged persons/ neighborhoods, public/private partnerships, land supply, infrastructure, and permitting. Policies encourage, but do not require, accommodation/retention of industrial businesses.		
Policies promote economic vitality and opportunity for all. The environment is considered an economic value. Services and infrastructure are to support economic policies. Policies support a regional economic strategy. Policies promote public/private partnerships. Policies promote retention and expansion of industries, firms and jobs within manufacturing and industrial areas. See the <u>King County Comprehensive Plan</u> Livable Urban Communities Chapter, Economic Development section.	Policies promote economic vitality and opportunity for all. The environment is considered an economic value. Services and infrastructure are to support economic policies. Policies support coordination with other jurisdictions, and agencies in regional economic strategies. Policies promote public/private partnerships. Strategies include encouragement of mixed-uses in commercial and office areas, with particular attention to Downtown. Plan promotes a mix of uses in Downtown whereby civic investment can spur private redevelopment. The plan supports industrial uses being retained until conversion to commercial use due to market changes. Refer to the Draft Land Use and Economic Development Sub-Elements.	The Preferred Alternative is similar to Alternative 2. Refer to the Final Land Use and Economic Development Sub-Elements in this document.
REGIONAL FINANCE AND GOVERNANCE		
Regional Finance and Governance. The policies require identification of regional funding sources and financing strategies, cooperation in regional financing plans, coordination with a regional governance plan identifying regional versus local services, potential consolidation of governments, interlocal agreements in Potential Annexation Areas, promotion of annexation in Potential Annexation Areas in the 20-year period, and other policies.		
Regarding coordination with other agencies, the plan supports coordination with special districts, service providers, adjacent jurisdictions, and State and Federal agencies regarding utilities, transportation, land use planning, etc. For example, see policies U-402, V-303, V-304, V-306, F-204, F-213, F-306, F-321, and others in the <u>King County Comprehensive Plan</u> . Regional finance strategies are promoted in policy U-414.	Policies address generally, planning in partnership with other agencies regarding services and utilities – see Draft Objective 2.8 and associated policies. (other references include Draft Objectives 2.4, 2.8, 2.9, 36.1, 36.2, 46.2, 46.3, 47.1, 47.2, 47.3, 48.1, 48.2, 48.4, 49.1, 49.2, 49.3, 50.1, 51.1, 51.2, 51.3 and associated policies.) The potential for Kenmore to work with Bothell and Kirkland to identify Potential Annexation Areas, and to coordinate services until annexation are addressed in Draft Objective 2.9 and associated policies. Finance strategies for capital improvements was proposed to be addressed in the Capital Facilities Element.	Policies address generally, planning in partnership with other agencies regarding services and utilities – see Objective 2.7 and associated policies. (other references include Final Objectives 2.4, 2.7, 2.8, 32.1, 32.2, 45.2, 45.3, 46.1, 46.2, 46.3, 47.1, 47.2, 47.3, 48.1, 49.1, 50.1, 50.2, 50.3 and associated policies.) The potential for Kenmore to work with Bothell and Kirkland to identify Potential Annexation Areas, and to coordinate services until annexation are addressed in Final Objective 2.8 and associated policies. Finance strategies for capital improvements are be addressed in the Final Capital Facilities Element .

Source: King County Countywide Planning Policies, 1995, and Bucher, Willis and Ratliff Corporation

- **Adjacent Jurisdiction Plans.** This section reviews the compatibility of the Alternatives with adjacent jurisdiction plans, in the key areas of land use and transportation.

Overall, there is compatibility with adjacent plans in terms of land use. The City of Bothell provides for lower densities in the Joint Study Area than the Kenmore Alternatives which would retain the King County designations (except for the Burke-Gilman Trail classified as Public and Private Institution in Alternative 2 and the Preferred), and Bothell's densities north of the City are a little lower than Kenmore's existing/planned designation of R-6. The City of Kirkland's planned uses in the Joint Study Area vary a little in extent and density, but are similar to those proposed by the three Alternatives, with the exception that the Preferred Alternative reclassifies the King County Library System property as Public and Private Institution.

In terms of transportation for Alternative 2 or the Preferred Alternative, there are some differences in Level of Service (LOS) standards with Bothell, and the State of Washington regarding NE Bothell Way (SR-522). Alternative 1 also has differences in LOS standards for NE Bothell Way with Bothell and the State of Washington (developed by the Washington State Transportation Commission). Differences in LOS for NE Bothell Way will likely be resolved when the State finalizes LOS standards for Highways of Statewide Significance, anticipated in 2001.

Alternative 2 or the Preferred Alternative also proposes a different classification for NE 145th Street (Collector) whereas King County classifies it as a local road.

For either Alternative 1 or 2, or the Preferred there are LOS and functional classification differences between Kenmore and Lake Forest Park regarding 55th Avenue NE. There are also differences for either Alternative regarding the functional classification system between Kenmore and Snohomish County. Snohomish County LOS standards are calculated differently and are difficult to compare, but the City's standards are generally similar or higher depending on roadways. Joint discussions between Kenmore and adjacent jurisdictions with appropriate plan amendments could resolve discrepancies.

**TABLE ENV-G
COMPATIBILITY OF ADJACENT PLANS**

ALTERNATIVE 1	ALTERNATIVE 2	PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
King County		
This Alternative would maintain the King County land use plan designations in the Joint Study Areas. Alternative land use policies are essentially the same as King County policies, with small modifications. Functional classifications match the King County Road Log, and LOS standards for intersections match King County's standards since the City has adopted King County regulations.	This Alternative would maintain the King County land use plan designations in the Joint Study Areas (except for the Burke-Gilman Trail classified as Public and Private Institution). Alternative land use policies are similar to King County policies, but are more locally tailored. Differences are found primarily in land use and housing policies with regard to phasing out of industrial uses, concentration of multi-family uses, and minimum densities in moderate and high density multi-family zones, but not in single-family zones. Functional classifications for roadways entering unincorporated King County are generally	This Alternative would maintain the King County land use plan designations in the Joint Study Areas, except for a parcel of land in the Kenmore-Kirkland Joint Study Area owned by the King County Library System, and the Burke-Gilman public trail. These properties have been reclassified Public and Private Institution. Differences in policies and functional classifications are similar to Alternative 2.

ALTERNATIVE 1	ALTERNATIVE 2	PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
	<p>compatible with the King County functional classification system in the King County Road Log, except that NE 145th Street would be a Collector in Kenmore instead of a local road</p> <p>Kenmore's proposed Principal Arterial functional classification for NE Bothell Way matches King County's system. Kenmore's intersection LOS (D-mitigated for monitoring purposes; with no LOS standard for concurrency) for NE Bothell Way is comparable to King County's intersection LOS standard of F.</p> <p>The proposed Kenmore LOS differs from the King County LOS for intersections south of the Sammamish River. Kenmore's LOS varies by road class with some LOS standards being higher or lower than the single King County LOS standard of D.</p>	
City of Bothell		
<p>This Alternative would maintain the King County land use plan designations in the Joint Study Areas. Bothell's proposed Plan designations in the Joint Study Area are less dense. However, until the time of annexation, ongoing development is meeting King County standards.</p> <p>North of Kenmore, property in the Bothell City limits is planned for densities of 2-5 units per acre, which is lower than Kenmore's existing designation of R-6, but not significantly different from the maximum of the range in Bothell.</p> <p>Kenmore's current functional class system matches Bothell's system for roadways in the Joint Study Area and other roads that serve both cities.</p> <p>Kenmore's LOS F for intersections on NE Bothell Way differs from Bothell's LOS standard of D at most intersections on NE Bothell Way.</p>	<p>This Alternative would maintain the King County land use plan designations in the Joint Study Areas (except for the Burke-Gilman Trail classified as Public and Private Institution).</p> <p>Bothell's proposed Plan designations in the Joint Study Area are less dense. However, until the time of annexation, ongoing development is meeting King County standards.</p> <p>North of Kenmore, property in the Bothell City limits is planned for densities of 2-5 units per acre, which is lower than Kenmore's proposed designation of R-6, but not significantly different from the maximum of the range in Bothell.</p> <p>Kenmore's proposed functional class system matches Bothell's system in the Joint Study Area. Kenmore's intersection LOS (D-mitigated for monitoring purposes; with no LOS standard for concurrency) for NE Bothell Way differs from Bothell's LOS standard of D at most intersections on NE Bothell Way.</p>	<p>The discussion for Alternative 2 would apply to the Preferred Alternative.</p>
City of Kirkland		
<p>The City of Kirkland has identified the Joint Kenmore-Kirkland Study Area as a Potential Annexation Area. The City of Kirkland has planned land uses for the Joint Study Area which are similar, but not identical in terms of commercial boundaries or in</p>	<p>The City of Kirkland has identified the Joint Kenmore-Kirkland Study Area as a Potential Annexation Area. The City of Kirkland has planned land uses for the Joint Study Area which are similar, but not identical in terms of commercial boundaries or in</p>	<p>The City of Kirkland has planned land uses for the Joint Study Area which are similar, but not identical to the Preferred Alternative in terms of commercial boundaries or in terms of multi-family densities. Designations in the Kirkland Comprehensive Plan</p>

ALTERNATIVE 1	ALTERNATIVE 2	PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
<p>terms of multi-family densities Designations in the Kirkland Comprehensive Plan include commercial, Residential – Medium Density, Residential High Density and Residential-Low Density.</p> <p>The City of Kirkland does not have planned functional classifications or LOS standards for roadways in the Potential Annexation Area. Where Juanita Drive enters the City of Kirkland, it is considered a Minor Arterial and is located within a subarea having an intersection LOS standard of F (V/C ratio of 1.1 and 1.2). Kenmore's functional classification of Minor Arterial is compatible with the City of Kirkland's classification for Juanita Drive. Kirkland's LOS F is lower than Kenmore's existing LOS standard of D.</p>	<p>terms of multi-family densities Designations in the Kirkland Comprehensive Plan include commercial, Residential – Medium Density, Residential High Density and Residential-Low Density.</p> <p>The City of Kirkland does not have planned functional classifications or LOS standards for roadways in the Potential Annexation Area. Where Juanita Drive enters the City of Kirkland, it is considered a Minor Arterial and is located within a subarea having an intersection LOS standard of F (V/C ratio of 1.1 and 1.2). Kenmore's proposed functional classification of Minor Arterial is compatible with the City of Kirkland's for Juanita Drive. Kirkland's LOS F is lower than Kenmore's proposed LOS standard of D.</p>	<p>include commercial, Residential – Medium Density, Residential High Density and Residential-Low Density. Another difference would be the King County Library System property classified in the Preferred Alternative as Public and Private Institution.</p> <p>The LOS and functional class discussions for Alternative 2 apply to the Preferred Alternative.</p>
City of Lake Forest Park		
<p>In the northwest quadrant of the City, no reclassifications are proposed. Generally, low-density single-family classifications lie adjacent to low-density single-family development in the City of Lake Forest Park.</p> <p>The Lake Forest Park and Kenmore functional classification of NE Bothell Way as a Principal Arterial is consistent. Lake Forest Park's LOS F standard is similar to Kenmore's existing LOS Standard of F for intersections on NE Bothell Way. The City of Lake Forest Park plans to amend their LOS for Bothell Way to be LOS D-mitigated, but has not yet completed that amendment.</p> <p>The Lake Forest Park classification of 55th Avenue NE as a Minor Arterial with a LOS standard of A differs from Kenmore's classification as a Collector with LOS E.</p>	<p>In the northwest quadrant of the City, no reclassifications are proposed. Generally, low-density single-family classifications lie adjacent to low density single-family development in the City of Lake Forest Park.</p> <p>The Lake Forest Park and Kenmore functional classification of NE Bothell Way as a Principal Arterial is consistent. Lake Forest Park's LOS F standard is comparable to Kenmore's proposed LOS Standard (D-mitigated for monitoring; no LOS for concurrency) for intersections on NE Bothell Way. The City of Lake Forest Park plans to amend their LOS for Bothell Way to be LOS D-mitigated, but has not yet completed that amendment.</p> <p>The Lake Forest Park classification of 55th Avenue NE as a Minor Arterial with a LOS standard of A differs from Kenmore's classification as a Collector with LOS C.</p>	<p>The land use, LOS, and functional class discussions for Alternative 2 would apply to the Preferred Alternative, with one difference being that the Tolt Pipeline would be classified as Public and Private Institution.</p>
Snohomish County		
<p>In the unincorporated area north of the City of Kenmore, low density residential of 4-6 dwelling units per acre is planned which is compatible with Kenmore's current R-6 classification.</p> <p>The County's functional classification system does not match the City's system for roadways that connect between the County and City. The County's classification of</p>	<p>In the unincorporated area north of the City of Kenmore, low density residential of 4-6 dwelling units per acre is planned which is compatible with Kenmore's proposed R-6 classification</p> <p>The County's functional classification system partially matches the City's system for roadways that connect between the County and City. The County's</p>	<p>The land use, LOS, and functional class discussions for Alternative 2 would apply to the Preferred Alternative.</p>

ALTERNATIVE 1	ALTERNATIVE 2	PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
<p>Locust Way (feeds into 61st Avenue NE) is as a Collector whereas the City's current classification of 61st Avenue NE is as a Minor Arterial. 14th Avenue (which feeds into 73rd Avenue NE) is classified by the County as a Minor Arterial whereas the City's classification of 73rd Avenue NE is as a Collector.</p> <p>The County's LOS standard is based upon arterial units, and is E. Kenmore's current LOS of E for intersections north of the Sammamish River is based on a different methodology as it addresses intersections, but is generally compatible.</p>	<p>classification of Locust Way (feeds into 61st Avenue NE) is as a Collector whereas the City's proposed classification of 61st Avenue NE is as a Principal Arterial. 14th Avenue (which feeds into 73rd Avenue NE) is classified by the County as a Minor Arterial consistent with the proposed Kenmore classification as a Minor Arterial.</p> <p>The County's LOS standard of E for arterial units is calculated differently than for intersection LOS which would be used by Kenmore. Kenmore's LOS standard for intersections would be C, D, or E depending on functional classification.</p>	
State of Washington		
<p>The State has adopted LOS D-mitigated for Highways of Statewide Significance (mitigate congestion when peak period level of service falls below LOS D). Kenmore's LOS E would not be fully consistent with the State's adopted Urban LOS criteria for Highways of Statewide Significance that include SR-522. The plan acknowledges that SR-522 is at design capacity and that aggressive transit strategies are needed. However, plan policies support the multi-modal improvement plan of SR-522 consistent with WSDOT plans.</p> <p>It should be noted that concurrency requirements of the Growth Management Act do not apply to Highways of Statewide Significance, meaning that development may not be prohibited, or transportation improvements or strategies may not be required to improve levels of service within a 6-year time period. Additionally, the State LOS criteria and methodology may be amended in the future as a new State transportation plan is adopted, potentially by the year 2001 or 2002.</p>	<p>The State has adopted LOS D-mitigated for Highways of Statewide Significance (mitigate congestion when peak period level of service falls below LOS D). Kenmore's intersection LOS would be D-mitigated for monitoring purposes; with no LOS standard for concurrency. The plan acknowledges that SR-522 is at design capacity and that aggressive transit strategies are needed. However, plan policies support the multi-modal improvement plan of SR-522 consistent with WSDOT plans.</p> <p>It should be noted that concurrency requirements of the Growth Management Act do not apply to Highways of Statewide Significance, meaning that development may not be prohibited, or transportation improvements or strategies may not be required to improve levels of service within a 6-year time period. Additionally, the State LOS criteria and methodology may be amended in the future as a new State transportation plan is adopted, potentially by the year 2001 or 2002.</p>	<p>The LOS discussions for Alternative 2 would apply to the Preferred Alternative.</p>

Sources: [Imagine Bothell](#), [The 1994 King County Comprehensive Plan](#) (updated), Snohomish County [GMA Comprehensive Plan 2000 Consolidated Docket of Amendments Draft SEIS](#), personal communication, cities of Lake Forest Park and Kirkland, and Bucher, Willis and Ratliff Corporation

- Northshore Utility District Water and Sewer Plans.** The Northshore Utility District Water and Sewer Plans address the jurisdictions of Lake Forest Park, Kenmore, Bothell, Woodinville, Kirkland and King County. For Kenmore, the Utility District plans assume a 1999 population of 18,946, and a 2020 population of 23,835. The total population planned in the District is 85,258. Based on *land use*

plans, however, the District is planning for a “buildout” under current zoning that would support a Districtwide population of 93,937. Although not allocated among the jurisdictions, if the larger population figure is allocated in the same proportion as the previous figures, Kenmore’s 2020 population would equal 26,261. These population estimates are lower than the population estimates prepared for the Alternatives in this Final EIS for three reasons: 1) the District’s population estimates are based upon Puget Sound Regional Council growth estimates that are based upon past trends; 2) The District’s buildout estimates assume lower development densities; 3) the District’s estimates assume a lower household size partly based on PSRC projections and based on Utility District Staff determinations

Assuming a household size of 2.4⁶, one could expect 34,162 persons total in the Planning Area in 2020 under Alternative 1, 35,414 under Alternative 2, or 35,119 with the Preferred Alternative. Using a household size of 2.4, the City’s population for Alternative 1 would equal 30,352, 31,606 with Alternative 2, and 31,339 under the Preferred Alternative. If Kenmore’s household size were reduced to be equivalent to the District’s projected household size of 2.4 for single-family units and an average 1.5 for multi-family units, the projected growth for Alternative 1 would equal 25,009, the projected growth for Alternative 2 would equal 25,701, and the projected growth for the Preferred Alternative would equal 25,529. If including the entire Kenmore Planning Area, the population would equal 28,196 for Alternative 1, 28,889 for Alternative 2, and 28,699 for the Preferred Alternative. Using a lower household size, Kenmore’s Comprehensive Plan population statistics would be more consistent with the Utility District’s plans for Kenmore.

- **Kenmore Vision Statement.** The Kenmore Vision Statement was prepared by the Planning Commission in December 1999-January 2000, and approved by the City Council in March 2000. The Vision Statement has guided the preparation of the Kenmore Comprehensive Plan.

**TABLE ENV-H
COMPATIBILITY WITH KENMORE VISION STATEMENT**

ALTERNATIVE 1	ALTERNATIVE 2	PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
A community that is family friendly with a small town feeling, that recognizes its history, and is open to and values diversity.		
<p>Policies do not address a small town feeling for the Kenmore area.</p> <p>Policies support the identification and preservation of historic resources. Plan promotes cultural arts programs and activities. For example, see policies CR-201, CR-202, CR203, CR-206, CR-303, CR-404 and others.</p> <p>Policies address diversity in planning, employment and housing. Examples include: Policies U-101, ED-301, H-601, H-604 and others.</p> <p>Referenced policies are found in the <u>King County Comprehensive Plan</u>.</p>	<p>Alternative 2 addresses a “small town <i>feeling</i>” and a community that is family friendly in several policies including, Draft Objectives 1.1, 4.6, 7.1, 7.2, and 8.6 and associated policies.</p> <p>Policies support the identification and preservation of historic resources. Plan promotes cultural arts programs and activities. For example, see Objectives 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3, and associated policies in the Draft Land Use Element. Also see Objective 8.2 and associated policies in the Draft Community Design Sub-Element</p>	<p>Alternative 2 addresses a “small town <i>feeling</i>” and a community that is family friendly in several policies including, Final Objectives 1.1, 4.5, 7.1, and 8.5 and associated policies.</p> <p>Policies support the identification and preservation of historic resources. Plan promotes cultural arts programs and activities. For example, see Objectives 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3, and associated policies in the Final Land Use Sub-Element.</p> <p>Policies address diversity in the Land Use Sub-Element and the Economic Development Sub-</p>

⁶ A household size of 2.4 is based upon PSRC projections for the year 2020 for FAZ 5535, derived from dividing PSRC’s estimated future population by PSRC’s estimated future total dwellings. Although PSRC’s future growth projections are different than those analyzed for the Alternatives reviewed in the Kenmore Comprehensive Plan/EIS, use of the PSRC numbers to develop future household size estimates is considered conservative and appropriate for planning purposes since PSRC’s household size estimate for the Year 2000 is close to the State Office of Financial Management household size numbers for the Year 2000.

ALTERNATIVE 1	ALTERNATIVE 2	PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
	Design Sub-Element. Policies address diversity in the Land Use Sub-Element and the Economic Development. See Draft Policies LU-1.1.1, LU-25.1.3. The Draft Housing Element supports provision of housing to all income levels and those with special needs.	Element. See Policies LU-1.1.1, LU-25.1.3. The Final Housing Element supports provision of housing to all income levels and those with special needs.
A community that fosters a sense of belonging and pride, makes use of the vast skills of its citizens, and promotes volunteerism		
Policies address creation of volunteer programs, particularly regarding wildlife habitat enhancement. See Policy NE-614 in the <u>King County Comprehensive Plan</u> .	Community pride is addressed in Draft Objectives 1.1 and 7.1 with their associated policies. Volunteerism is addressed in Draft Objective 44.3 and Policy PS-44.3.1.	Community pride is addressed in Final Objectives 1.1 and 7.1 with their associated policies. Volunteerism is addressed in Final Objective 43.3 and Policy PS-43.3.1.
A community that has preserved the character of its single-family residential neighborhoods, which offers a range of housing types and prices to ensure an adequate choice of attractive living accommodations, and promotes compatible housing		
Alternative 1 provides for low, medium, and high density land use categories. It includes policies encouraging preservation of the existing housing stock. Affordable housing targets are included. Other policies include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Range of single-family and multi-family densities, with minimum densities in zones with 4 or more units. (However, there is a discrepancy between the policies and the Interim Zoning Code. The City's Interim Zoning Code does not apply minimum density requirements in the R-4, R-6 and R-8 zones.) • Encouragement of mixed-uses in commercial and office areas. • Density bonuses offered in residential (more than 4 units), commercial and office zones. Density bonuses encouraged for affordable housing, energy conservation, historic preservation and parks/open space. • Encouragement of attached and detached housing in single-family areas. • Promotion of scattered site multi-family where possible. • Establishment of county housing programs, and coordination with State and Federal agencies to facilitate affordable housing. • Mobile home parks encouraged to be retained. 	Alternative 2 provides for low, medium, and high density land use categories. It includes policies encouraging preservation of the existing housing stock. Affordable housing targets are included. Other policies include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Range of single-family and multi-family densities. Minimum density applied zones with 12 or more units. Other policies requiring an average zoning density of 7 du/ac, housing targets, affordable housing targets, and annual monitoring of the plan should result in sufficient densities being achieved in zones with less than 12 units per acre. • Encouragement of mixed-uses in commercial and office areas, with particular attention to Downtown. • Density bonuses offered in residential, commercial and office zones. Density bonuses encouraged for affordable housing, additional pervious surface, parks/open space. In Downtown density bonuses for shared/structured parking and for lot consolidation. Added a density bonus in R-1 that may only be transferred offsite. Downtown identified as density receiving area for offsite density transfers. • Single-family predominance in single-family zones. 	The Preferred Alternative is similar to Alternative, but has the following refinements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promotion of Uniform Building Code review to determine measures to achieve desired densities (e.g. allowing more floors of wood frame construction) • Creation of two sub-elements to emphasize important policies: Residential Neighborhoods and Affordable Housing Sub-Elements • Clarification that housing for persons with special needs can apply to any income level <p>Refer to the Final Land Use and Housing Elements of this document.</p>

ALTERNATIVE 1	ALTERNATIVE 2	PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
Refer to the <u>King County Comprehensive Plan</u> Livable Urban Communities Chapter, Land Use, and Housing sections.	<p>single-family zones.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concentration of multi-family in Downtown or along arterials. Mobile home parks may be retained, but due to economic life of mobile homes, potential conversion may occur. Promotion of programs to help fund relocation into nearby affordable housing. Support for county programs, and coordination with State and Federal agencies to facilitate affordable housing. Also, identification of local role in promoting housing for all economic segments of the community. Refer to the Draft Land Use and Housing Elements. 	
A community that actively protects natural and environmentally sensitive areas, significant open space, and trees		
Policies address fish and wildlife habitat, including streams, lakes, and wetlands. Refer to the Natural Environment, and Parks, Open Space and Recreation Sections of Chapters 4 and 5 in the <u>King County Comprehensive Plan</u> . The Land Use Element supports the environmental policies by applying lower densities in highly sensitive areas such as Swamp Creek.	Nearly every Element addresses environmental protection. Relevant policies addressing fish and wildlife, wetlands, and shorelines are primarily contained in the Draft Natural Environment Sub-Element, Shoreline Sub-Element, Surface Water Element, and Parks, Recreation and Open Space Element. The Draft Land Use Element supports the environmental policies by applying lower densities in highly sensitive areas such as Swamp Creek.	The discussion for Alternative 2 applies to the Preferred Alternative. In comparison to Alternative 2, the Preferred Alternative would strengthen wetland alteration enforcement, clarify fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas, and emphasize the City's response to the Federal 4(d) rules. The Final Elements of this document may be referenced.
A community with an attractive, vital, pedestrian-oriented city center offering commercial, civic, cultural and park spaces, integrated with higher density housing		
Policies in the <u>King County Comprehensive Plan</u> identify a Kenmore activity center where mixed-uses and transit-oriented development should occur.	A key focus of the Plan is to identify and support the creation of a "Downtown Kenmore" with a mix of uses, transit-oriented development, and public investment or incentives encouraging private development.	The discussion for Alternative 2 applies to the Preferred Alternative.
A community with clear design standards creating attractive, functional, and enduring buildings and places		
Policies address design characteristics in the Kenmore activity center. For example, see policies CI-4, K-12, and U-608 in the <u>King County Comprehensive Plan</u> .	<p>Policies address design characteristics in Downtown, and along major commercial corridors such as Bothell Way. Sample policies include:</p> <p>Draft Land Use Element: Goal 1, Objective 1.2 and Policy LU-1.2.1; Policies LU-2.1.3, LU-2.1.4, and LU-2.3.4.</p> <p>Draft Downtown Sub-Element Goal 4, Objectives 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4 and associated Policies</p>	<p>Policies address design characteristics in Downtown, and along major commercial corridors such as NE Bothell Way. Sample policies include:</p> <p>Final Land Use Element: Policies LU-2.1.3, LU-2.1.4, and LU-2.3.4.</p> <p>Final Downtown Sub-Element Goal 4, Objectives 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5 and associated Policies</p> <p>Goal 5, Objectives 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, 5.5 and associated Policies</p>

ALTERNATIVE 1	ALTERNATIVE 2	PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
	<p>Goal 5, Objectives 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, 5.5 and associated Policies</p> <p>Objectives 6.1, 6.2, 6.3 and associated Policies</p> <p>Draft Community Design Sub-Element: Objective 8.4 and Policy LU-8.4.1; Objective 12.1 and Policy LU-12.1.1; Objective 12.2 and Policy LU-12.2.1; Objective 12.3 and associated Policies</p> <p>Draft Economic Development Sub-Element : Objective 25.5 and associated Policies</p>	<p>Objectives 6.1, 6.2, 6.3 and associated Policies</p> <p>Final Community Design Sub-Element: Objective 8.3 and Policy LU-8.3.1; Objective 12.1 and Policy LU-12.1.1; Objective 12.2 and associated Policies</p> <p>Final Economic Development Sub-Element : Objective 25.5 and associated Policies</p>
A community that manages its traffic well, and is united by a safe and effective system of streets, transit routes, sidewalks, and trails, linking significant regional and local destinations		
<p>Policies support of alternate modes of travel. There is an emphasis on transit improvements as well as capital improvements. Improvements are to be in place to support growth at time of or within six years of development. Policies and implementing regulations allow public and private streets. Refer to Chapter 6 of the <u>King County Comprehensive Plan</u>.</p>	<p>Policies support of alternate modes of travel. There is an emphasis on transit improvements as well as capital improvements. Improvements are to be in place to support growth at time of or within six years of development. Additionally, the Draft policies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on support of Downtown, and local circulator system. • Change functional classifications for some roads. • Emphasize completing a pedestrian/nonmotorized transportation network. • Minimize use of local access tracts in favor of minor access streets to minimize impacts to neighborhood character and to achieve more regular street pattern. • Require new streets to be publicly dedicated, encourage existing private streets to be maintained consistently, and encourage ultimate inclusion of private streets into the public street system. • Establish sidewalk priorities for arterial and local streets. • Address the continued operation of the Air Harbor, and ways to minimize conflicts <p>Refer to the Draft Transportation Element.</p>	<p>The policies in the Preferred Alternative are similar to Alternative 2, with the following additional refinements not listed under Alternative 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creation of two sub-elements, particularly to emphasize transit and alternative modes: Transportation Facility, Level of Service, and Funding Sub-Element and Transit and Alternative Mode Sub-Element. • Elimination of proposed 83rd Place NE extension (bridge) option. • Identification of potential alternative emergency vehicle routes in areas with severe congestion. • Recognition and encouragement of potential regional ferry services on Lake Washington. • Emphasis on maintaining HOV lanes for transit only. • Additional emphasis on multi-agency coordination regarding SR-522. • Encouragement to study signal timing with WSDOT, particularly at SR-522 and 68th Avenue NE. <p>Refer to the Final Transportation Element.</p>
A community that supports and encourages quality schools, diverse and continuing education opportunities		
<p>Policies address having adequate schools in concurrent with development and coordination with schools in cultural resource plans. For example, see Policies F-103, F-209, and CR-401 in the <u>King County</u></p>	<p>Policies support coordination with the Northshore and Lake Washington School Districts, Bastyr University and other continuing education programs. For example, Draft Land Use</p>	<p>Policies support coordination with the Northshore and Lake Washington School Districts, Bastyr University and other continuing education programs. For example, Final Land Use</p>

ALTERNATIVE 1	ALTERNATIVE 2	PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
<u>Comprehensive Plan.</u>	Element: Goal 1, Objective 1.2 and Policy LU-1.2.4 Draft Public Services Element: Policy PS-44.1.1; Goal 47, Objectives 47.1, 47.2, 47.3, and associated Policies	Element: Goal 1, Objective 1.2 and Policy LU-1.2.3 Final Public Services Element: Policy PS-43.1.1; Goal 46, Objectives 46.1, 46.2, 46.3, and associated Policies. The Preferred Alternative also provides more emphasis on inventorying educational facilities and programs available to Kenmore.
A community with a network of parks, trails, open spaces, and recreational facilities providing for passive and active recreation, and waterfront access		
Policies emphasize regional park system. Policies promote the protection of critical areas. Refer to the Natural Environment, and Parks, Open Space and Recreation Sections of Chapters 4 and 5 in the <u>King County Comprehensive Plan.</u>	Policies address local park and recreation services, with maintenance and acquisition priorities. Policies encourage coordination and partnerships with local and regional regional park and recreation providers. Policies promote the protection of critical areas. Refer to the Draft Natural Environment Sub-Element and Draft Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Element.	Policies Address local park and recreation services, with maintenance and acquisition priorities. Policies encourage coordination and partnerships with local and regional regional park and recreation providers. Policies promote the protection of critical areas. The Preferred Alternative also includes the following refinements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promotion of concept to identify and consider regional and local views for pedestrians and drivers • Identification of important view corridors to Lake Washington and the Sammamish River, and methods to retain and enhance them (based in part on the Draft EIS recommendations) • Selection of an Interim Level of Service Standard for Local Parks, 2 acres per 1,000 population. Refer to the Final Natural Environment Sub-Element and Final Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Element.
A community with clear public priorities that efficiently and effectively utilizes its public resources		
Policies support efficient land use patterns for efficient service delivery, and multipurpose/shared facilities in the Facilities and Utilities Sections of Chapter 7, the Cultural Resources Section of Chapter 5, and the Urban Land Use Section of Chapter 2, all found in the <u>King County Comprehensive Plan.</u>	Policies address compact, serviceable development patterns; funding, acquisition and maintenance priorities for facilities such as parks, sidewalks, and surface water; providing multiple purpose facilities; partnerships with agencies; volunteerism; and other means to efficiently use resources. The policies are found in the Draft Land Use, Transportation, Parks and Recreation, Surface Water, Public Services, Utilities, and Capital Facilities Elements.	The discussion for Alternative 2 applies to the Preferred Alternative. Final Elements in this document may be referenced.

ALTERNATIVE 1	ALTERNATIVE 2	PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
A community with an economic base that provides for the needs of its citizens and provides quality employment opportunities		
Policies promote economic vitality and opportunity for all. The environment is considered an economic value. Services and infrastructure are to support economic policies. Policies support a regional economic strategy. Policies promote public/private partnerships. Policies promote retention and expansion of industries, firms and jobs within manufacturing and industrial areas. See the <u>King County Comprehensive Plan</u> Livable Urban Communities Chapter, Economic Development section.	Policies promote economic vitality and opportunity for all. The environment is considered an economic value. Services and infrastructure are to support economic policies. Policies support coordination with other jurisdictions, and agencies in regional economic strategies. Policies promote public/private partnerships. Strategies include encouragement of mixed-uses in commercial and office areas, with particular attention to Downtown. Plan promotes a mix of uses in Downtown whereby civic investment can spur private redevelopment. The plan supports industrial uses being retained until conversion to commercial use due to market changes. Refer to the Draft Land Use and Economic Development Sub-Elements.	The discussion for Alternative 2 applies to the Preferred Alternative. Final Elements in this document may be referenced.
A community that is attentive to, and seeks to provide, for the health, safety, and welfare of all its citizens		
A broad range of services is addressed including: human services, community services, housing services, emergency services, provision of adequate utilities, land use regulation, environmental protection. These are addressed throughout the <u>King County Comprehensive Plan</u> .	A broad range of services is addressed including: human services, community services, housing services, emergency services, provision of adequate utilities, land use regulation, environmental protection. These are addressed throughout the Draft Plan.	The discussion for Alternative 2 applies to the Preferred Alternative. Final Elements in this document may be referenced.
A community that is a good partner with citizens and governments throughout the region		
Regarding coordination with other agencies, the plan supports coordination with special districts, service providers, adjacent jurisdictions, and State and Federal agencies regarding utilities, transportation, land use planning, etc. (for example, U-402, V-303, V-304, V-306, F-204, F-213, F-306, F-321, and others in the <u>King County Comprehensive Plan</u> Implementation Chapter)	Regarding coordination with other agencies, the plan supports coordination with special districts, service providers, adjacent jurisdictions, and State and Federal agencies regarding utilities, transportation, land use planning, etc. For example, see Draft Objectives 2.4, 2.8, 2.9, 36.1, 36.2, 46.2, 46.3, 47.1, 47.2, 47.3, 48.1, 48.2, 48.4, 49.1, 49.2, 49.3, 50.1, 51.1, 51.2, 51.3 and associated policies.	Regarding coordination with other agencies, the plan supports coordination with special districts, service providers, adjacent jurisdictions, and State and Federal agencies regarding utilities, transportation, land use planning, etc. For example, see Final Objectives 2.4, 2.7, 2.8, 32.1, 32.2, 45.2, 45.3, 46.1, 46.2, 46.3, 47.1, 47.2, 47.3, 48.1, 49.1, 50.1, 50.2, 50.3 and associated policies.

ALTERNATIVE 1	ALTERNATIVE 2	PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
A community with an informed citizenry working with an open, responsive government that seeks out and integrates public input		
Policies support expeditious, predictable, and responsive land use regulations. The process is to offer effective public notice. (Policy I-401 in the <u>King County Comprehensive Plan</u> Implementation Chapter)	Policies support expeditious, predictable, and responsive land use regulations. The process is to offer effective public notice. Policies support strengthening communication with citizens, business owners, property owners, and others. Also, there are commitments to support timely, predictable and fair permit processes, as well as public involvement. (see Draft Policy LU-2.2.3, and Draft Objectives 44.1 and 45.3 plus associated policies in the Draft Land Use and Public Services Elements)	Preferred Alternative policies are similar to Alternative 2. See Policy LU-2.2.3, and Objectives 43.1 and 44.3 plus associated policies in the Final Land Use and Public Services Elements of this document.

Source: Kenmore Vision Statement, March 13, 2000 and Bucher, Willis and Ratliff Corporation

Mitigation

- For Alternative 1, the Zoning Code could be amended to require minimum densities in all residential zones. Another option would be that the City could petition the Growth Management Planning Council to amend the policy requiring minimum densities in favor of an approach that lets jurisdictions determine how to provide for urban densities in their cities.
- Alternative 2 or the Preferred Alternative could be amended to promote minimum densities in all residential zones or to provide stronger statements about monitoring of minimum densities in zones having less than 12 units per acre. Another option would be that the City could petition the Growth Management Planning Council to amend the policy requiring minimum densities in favor of an approach that lets jurisdictions determine how to provide for urban densities in their cities.
- The City could work with adjacent jurisdictions and WSDOT to determine compatible functional classifications and levels of service for roadways.
- Objectives 2.7, 48.1 and their associated policies address joint planning, and coordination with the Northshore Utility District including development projections.

Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

No unavoidable adverse impacts are anticipated. If plan conflicts are not resolved at the plan adoption stage or through future plan amendments, there would be significant adverse impacts in terms of Land Use Plan consistency.

Aesthetics/Light and Glare

Affected Environment

Please refer to the **Land Use, Downtown, and Community Design** Sub-Elements of this Comprehensive Plan for further background information. Basic findings include:

- The overall pattern of development is 4 to 6 homes per acre.
- Outside the Downtown area, Kenmore neighborhoods generally consist of homes built since 1980. Streets were built to King County standards for residential access streets and generally lack sidewalks. Some streets have drainage ditches on road sides. Street trees are found in neighborhoods away from the Downtown area.
- The northwest section of the Planning Area is largely single-family residences, characterized by hilly topography and views of Lake Washington. Along Lake Washington are waterfront condominiums and waterfront commercial/industrial uses. The northeast section of Kenmore consists of open space associated with the Swamp Creek wetlands as well as single-family housing. South of the Sammamish River neighborhoods are largely residential, although the Inglemoor Golf Course and St. Edward State Park provide heavily vegetated open spaces west of Juanita Drive.
- Multi-family housing developments often feature large parking lots facing pedestrian thoroughfares. The bulk and scale of these developments does not provide for a transition to adjacent residential uses of a lower intensity.
- Many buildings in the Downtown commercial area are not built to the edge of the street, are of discontinuous size, location, and shape, and do not form a consistent or recognizable urban form. Most are low scale (one-to-two story) commercial and retail buildings and include fast food restaurants, service stations, supermarkets, and other auto-oriented businesses.
- Parking lots and signs on tall poles dominate much of the appearance of the Downtown core area and contribute to the suburban commercial strip character of the City along SR-522.
- Trees are lacking along major arterials. Most of the residential areas surrounding the Downtown commercial area have no sidewalks or street trees.
- SR-522 is highly congested with regional automobile traffic during peak hours, affecting the travel ability of many local residents. Typically, a paved shoulder with few sidewalks separates property adjacent to this roadway.
- The Sammamish River and Lake Washington are visual assets to the City. Views to these water features are found from numerous vantage points along NE Bothell Way and from residential areas on the City's hillsides.
- Under all alternatives a pedestrian bridge will be built across SR-522 in the vicinity of 61st Street as part of the LakePointe Mixed Use Master Plan.

Additional analysis of view corridors was conducted for the purpose of this EIS. Current conditions include:

- Public views of the Sammamish River and Lake Washington are limited in the core Kenmore urban area around the junction of 68th Avenue NE and SR-522. The most accessible views are in areas that are directly on the water, and at higher elevations in the landscape, and primarily along public road right-of-ways. Other view corridors exist in locations that provide visual connections to routes that could lead to public shorelines, such as the top of the stairs behind the QFC at the Kenmore Park-and-Ride west of 68th Avenue NE. Existing view corridors are:

- Along elevated sections of SR-522 and the Burke-Gilman Trail west of 68th Avenue NE, where Lake Washington is either visible through gaps in trees, or through trees in the winter, and in areas not blocked by buildings and the cement plant
- On the 68th Avenue NE bridge with views up the Sammamish River and toward Lake Washington
- Along open shoreline areas of Log Boom Park, and its pier
- Limited views exist of the water and ships docked at the cement plant southwest of the 68th Avenue NE/SR-522 intersection west to 66th Avenue NE. However, heavy automobile traffic interferes with views in this view corridor.
- Water views of the Sammamish River are found on the shore at Swamp Creek Park.
- Visual connections are identified as logical pedestrian desire lines that are visually linking walking routes known to lead to water access, or that will be built in the future into waterfront developments, or where river edge vegetation is visible from roadsides indicating the presence of water. These connections are logical paths pedestrians will take to find water access. Existing visual connections are found:
 - Between the QFC and neighboring businesses south of the Park-and-Ride
 - At the crest of 66th Avenue NE west of City Hall there are views of river vegetation and some potential views of Lake Washington.
 - Internal pathway locations of future master planned areas.

Refer to **Figure PR-2 in Chapter 7, Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Element**, to review illustrations of existing view corridors.

Impacts

General Citywide

- Views from residential neighborhoods at higher elevations to the Downtown core may change, depending on future building heights and scale. Building height and bulk in Downtown and along NE Bothell Way, as well as the planting of street trees, could impact some views to Lake Washington at lower elevations. The level of impact may vary depending on topography, building location and design, architectural treatments, landscaping, etc. The potential for aesthetic impacts is a topic that should be addressed in phased environmental review as development regulations are adopted or specific projects are reviewed.
- The pedestrian bridge to be built as part of the LakePointe development would have a visual impact along the SR-522 corridor through Kenmore.
- Alternatives 1, 2, and the Preferred Alternative concentrate development Downtown, and, thus, preserve the existing character of local single-family neighborhoods. Alternative 2 or the Preferred Alternative include policies that would further protect single-family neighborhoods by making single-family dwellings the primary use and restricting the use of access tracts.

Downtown

- Under Concepts B and C, structured parking would be encouraged in lieu of additional surface parking.
- Under Concept C, the redevelopment south of SR-522 and east of 68th Avenue NE would be designed as a master planned development, and as such would have greater visual cohesion than currently exists in the commercial center.
- Concept A would continue the existing pattern of development in the Downtown center with new growth occurring on undeveloped/under-used parcels. Development would occur primarily through the private sector and single-use buildings would be standard. Signage patterns would continue. Surface parking would remain the norm. Few changes would occur along SR-522. Minimal impacts from light/glare would be expected.
- Concept B would focus on a "mixed-use" zone as redevelopment west of 68th Avenue NE between SR-522 and NE 182nd Street. Mixed-use buildings would encourage residential units above or adjacent to commercial/business offices, leading to greater visual variety of architecture. Changes to commercial development along SR-522 could occur between 65th and 68th Avenues NE. Depending on building materials and lighting fixtures, impacts from light/glare may occur for drivers and surrounding residential areas.
- Concept C would shift the core area away from north side of SR-522 west of 68th Avenue NE and would call for new mixed-use zoning. New street patterns and development would provide opportunities for visual improvements. Public uses and civic center would take advantage of water views. Additional lighting would be introduced to the area and would be visible at night from residential areas on the south side of the Sammamish River. Glare from sunlight reflected off new development along the river could impact residential areas on the south side of the River.
- To comply with Policy P-39.5.1, view corridors should be identified and protected. Potential redevelopment of the Kenmore "Downtown" presents opportunities to create new views and visual linkages. The potential view corridors include existing view corridors, but with enhancements, either in land acquisition for improved land development strategies, or the removal of visual obstacles to water views in both future public and private development. Other potential view corridors can be created as the direct result of new street and walkway development in Downtown areas, such as in the northwest quadrant bounded by 68th Ave. NE and SR-522, or in the southeast quadrant at the same intersection. Potential view corridor locations are:
 - Existing areas along SR-522, from 68th Avenue NE to 61st Ave. NE, along Burke Gilman Trail just west of Log Boom Park to 68th Avenue NE
 - View of bay by the cement plant, and the future LakePointe development from the northwest corner of the SR-522/ 68th Avenue NE intersection
 - From internal roads and side paths of the future LakePointe project (if developed)
 - From trail connections along the Sammamish River
 - From internal streets of new development areas east of 68th Avenue NE and south of the new Kenmore Loop Road/NE 175th Street if they occur
 - From Kenmore Park, and portions of NE 175th Street near the sewage pump station

- From the road frontage of Swamp Creek Park on 175th Street NE if vegetation is thinned out to create views
- From 68th Avenue NE bridge.

Mitigation

General Citywide

- All Alternatives propose the addition of street trees and sidewalks.
- All Alternatives propose pedestrian walkways along urban trails and along the Sammamish River.
- Alternatives 1, 2, and the Preferred Alternative concentrate development Downtown and thus preserve the existing character of local neighborhoods. Alternative 2 or the Preferred Alternative include policies that would further protect single-family neighborhoods by making single-family dwellings the primary use and restricting the use of access tracts.
- Policy LU-2.4.3 is to "Ensure that infrastructure and facilities are sized appropriately to community needs and are located with attention to the desired neighborhood character."
- Objective 3.1 is to "promote and support visual, literary, and cultural arts and activities in the community."
- Objective 3.2 is to "promote the preservation of significant historic and archaeological sites and structures."
- Goal 4 of the Comprehensive Plan is to "Make Downtown the focal point of the community."

Objective 4.5 states: "Beautify Downtown with attractive, functional, and enduring buildings and places." Associated policies address design and signage standards.

- Goal 5 of the Comprehensive Plan is to "Promote Downtown as a vital, pedestrian friendly center."

Objective 5.1 is to "Increase pedestrian activity in the city center, and encourage pedestrian-oriented uses and designs."

Policy LU-5.2.2 states: "Design and implement a sidewalk system in the Downtown. Ensure that crosswalks are identifiable and contribute to the design and intended character of the Downtown."

Policy LU-5.2.6 states, "Promote pedestrian-friendly streets with street furniture and trees. Develop street trees and vegetation standards that unify the Downtown, define Downtown streets, and allow for appropriate business visibility. Incorporate street furniture and art into Downtown street standards, including benches, trash and recycling receptacles, tree grates, street lamps, and other amenities."

- Goal 6 states: "Link downtown to the rest of the community."

Objective 6.1: "Strengthen the connections between Downtown and the neighborhoods."

Policy LU-6.1.1: "Develop an integrated and hierarchical street tree, signage, and public art program to identify Downtown, government facilities, and parks throughout the community."

Policy LU-6.1.2: "Ensure that appropriate development, design, and buffering techniques allow for a graduated transition between the Downtown and adjacent neighborhoods."

Objective 6.3: "Connect Downtown to the Lake Washington and Sammamish River waterfronts, and to area parks and open spaces."

Policy LU-6.3.1: "Ensure the sidewalk system is improved to allow for connections to the Burke-Gilman trail and to shoreline access areas established through the Shoreline Master Program permit process."

Policy LU-6.3.2: "Establish a primary and secondary path network in and around Downtown with connections to the waterfront. The primary network consists of sidewalks along streets and the Burke-Gilman Trail. The secondary network consists of off-street non-motorized paths encircling and bisecting Downtown blocks..."

- Goal 7 states: "Preserve and enhance Kenmore's small-town feeling."

Objective 7.2: "Maintain smaller-scale development in residential neighborhoods."

- Goal 8 states: "Create attractive, functional, and enduring buildings and places."

Objective 8.1: "Create a sense of place and identity for Kenmore while allowing for diversity."

Policy LU-8.1.1: "Through development quality, signage standards, landscape treatments, and public investment visible at community gateways and in a central Downtown, create a sense of identity and place for Kenmore."

Policy LU-8.1.2: "With input from Kenmore citizens and businesses, and using the assistance of qualified professionals, develop design standards consistent with the community vision, and establish a Design Review process. In particular, focus design review standards and guidelines towards Downtown as well as commercial and multi-family development Citywide. Ensure that provisions allow for creativity and flexibility while meeting common design principles."

Objective 8.2: "Use design standards that promote pedestrian-scale development with human-scale details and an orientation to the street."

Policy LU-8.2.1: "Encourage commercial, high density, and mixed-use developments to incorporate features that are oriented to a human-scale such as upper story setbacks, façade modulation, variety in building materials, benches, street trees, plazas, projecting signs, canopies, street lamps, hanging baskets, or other features."

Objective 8.3: "Encourage pedestrian-oriented street design."

Policy LU-8.3.1: "In coordination with the sidewalk priority system established in the Transportation Element, promote sidewalks along arterials and local streets, and sidewalk and path connections, where appropriate, to the off-street non-motorized trail network. For safety and aesthetic purposes, promote the use of landscaped buffers between curbs and sidewalks, particularly along arterials. Ensure appropriate levels of illumination. Encourage bus stops to have shelters and benches."

- Goal 9 of the Comprehensive Plan states: "Promote compatible development in residential neighborhoods."

Objective 9.1: "Prepare and implement development standards and regulations that acknowledge neighborhood character."

Objective 9.2: "Ensure that new housing is compatible with surrounding development in scale and/or design, and provides adequate on-site parking."

Policy LU-9.2.1: "Ensure single-family dwellings are designed in accordance with zoning code requirements applied to achieve compatible housing patterns yet allow for individuality, as well as improvement over time."

Policy LU-9.2.2: "Develop and apply multi-family design guidelines and standards to achieve quality development and compatibility with surrounding uses. Variation in facades, roof lines, and other building design features should be used to give a residential scale and identity to multi-family developments at the development edge. Require multi-family residential development to provide both common and private open space."

- Goal 10: "Provide for environmental quality, open space, and vegetation."

Objective 10.1: "Protect natural and environmentally sensitive areas, open space, trees, vegetation, natural terrain, and drainage."

Objective 10.2: "Integrate landscaping into streetscapes and developments and increase the biomass in the community."

Objective 10.3: "Encourage cluster residential along with open space for efficient service delivery and greater environmental protection."

- Goal 13 states "Practice environmental stewardship by protecting, enhancing, and promoting the natural environment in and around the City of Kenmore."

Objective 13.3: "Encourage a reduction in light and glare impacts throughout the community."

Policy LU-13.3.1: "Through design standards or educational opportunities, discourage the use of building materials or signage materials that cause glare impacts to substantial numbers of motorists or surrounding neighborhoods."

Policy LU-13.3.2: "Require appropriate illumination levels and light shields, and direction for lighting standards along streets, and in public open spaces and parks."

Policy LU-13.3.3: "Encourage residents to provide exterior lighting for security purposes which does not unduly impact their neighbors."

Policy LU-13.3.4: "Restrict light pointing up, affecting the view of the night sky."

- Goal 39 is to "Protect and provide visual and physical access to open spaces, shorelines, and environmentally sensitive areas."

Objective 39.4: "Connect open spaces with parks and trails to create a system of linear linkages between shorelines, parks, and environmentally sensitive areas. Consider viewpoints, view corridors, easements, bikeways, and scenic drives when looking for linkages."

Objective 39.5: “Maintain and enhance view corridors to Lake Washington and the Sammamish River.”

Policy P-39.5.1: “Identify important public view corridors to Lake Washington and the Sammamish River...”

Policy P-39.5.2: “Evaluate alternative development regulations and tools to maintain and enhance public view corridors to Lake Washington and the Sammamish River...”

Downtown

- Under Concepts B and C, structured parking would reduce surface parking.
- Under Concept C, the redevelopment south of SR-522 and east of 68th Avenue NE would be designed as a master planned development and as such would have greater visual cohesion than currently exists in the commercial center.
- Under Concept C, buildings of the city center along the Sammamish River could be required to use non-reflecting finishes and low-reflective glass. Street lighting could be designed to minimize impacts to off-site properties. Trees planted along the river would shield some of the off-site lighting impacts.
- Existing and potential view corridors should be preserved, maintained and improved where possible. Strategies for creating the visual access include the retention of existing views on public properties, and by regulation of design and through placing restrictions on private development:
 - Retain existing views currently in areas of public ownership, such as on City-owned lands. View corridors and pedestrian linkages can be used to form a skeleton of open spaces surrounded by buildings of future development plans for those areas.
 - Retain view corridors in existing road rights of way, recreational areas and regional trail corridors such as Log Boom Park, Kenmore Park, the Burke Gilman Trail, SR-522, and along 68th Avenue NE, by requiring adjacent new developments to provide visual access.
 - Create potential for view corridors in master planned areas by requiring them in the design and permitting of private property development proposals.
 - Direct future Downtown master plans through design and development regulations such as design guidelines to exploit potential water views. These regulatory devices would address massing of buildings, building heights, setbacks, and scale of the built and pedestrian environment.
 - Address potential interference in visual access such as the NE 175th Street pedestrian bridge connection to SR-522 by LakePointe. Bridge structures and design can be light and transparent in construction so as not to dominate the view lines to Lake Washington when viewed from properties north of SR-522.

Refer to **Figure PR-3** in the **Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Element, Chapter 7**, for illustrations of existing and future view corridors.

Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

No significant unavoidable adverse aesthetic impacts are anticipated.

Historic/Cultural Resources

Affected Environment

Please refer to **Section 4A**, the **Land Use Sub-Element** of this Comprehensive Plan for further background information. Basic findings include:

- Given Kenmore's location along Lake Washington and the Sammamish River, archaeological resources may be present as historic sites are often located along watercourses where fishing, hunting and gathering took place.
- The extension of the Seattle-Bothell Highway in 1913 largely influenced the community's growth pattern and population increases.
- While most of Kenmore's development is fairly recent, the City has several historic structures worthy of protection. Sites in Kenmore included in the King County Historic Resource Inventory (personal communication, Charles Sundberg, King County, November 8, 1999) include:
 - Kenmore Bridge over the Sammamish River
 - Kenmore Community Club
 - St. Edward Seminary
 - Thomsen Estate

Of the above sites included in the Inventory, the Kenmore Bridge and Kenmore Community Club are considered ineligible for King County Landmark status due to alterations and loss of historic integrity. St. Edward Seminary is eligible for Landmark status. The Thomsen Estate is the only designated King County Landmark in Kenmore. The Thomsen Estate may be eligible for listing on the State of Washington Heritage Register and the National Register of Historic Places.

- The St. Edward Seminary is listed on the State of Washington Heritage Register. It may be eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.

Impacts

- Under any Alternative, additional traffic could result in capital improvements to the Kenmore Bridge over the Sammamish River. However, this structure is ineligible for Landmark Status because of alterations made over time.
- Under Alternative 1, the Kenmore Community Club would be zoned Industrial. Under Alternative 2 or the Preferred Alternative, the Kenmore Community Club would be zoned Commercial. Under either designation, the structure could be demolished or converted to another use. However, currently, the structure is not considered eligible for landmark status.
- Under Alternative 1, public and private educational and governmental institutions are designated with residential classifications, which could possibly mean that the sites could be surplus and sold for

residential uses. Where properties have governmental ownerships this is less likely, than where there are private institutional ownerships, such as the Bastyr University area. Additional development in the proximity of the St. Edward Seminary could impact the landmark. Under the Public/Private Institution Designation proposed with Alternative 2, master plans for educational or governmental developments would help minimize impacts in the St. Edward State Park area. With the Preferred Alternative, the Special Study Area overlay district applied to the St. Thomas Seminary (Bastyr) will require master planning in consideration of environmental features and long-term goals of institutional and joint public use.

- No Alternatives studied would propose substantive new development in proximity to the County designated landmark, the Thomsen Estate. The site's Landmark Status limits the property owners' ability to alter the structure significantly.

Mitigation

- Goal 3 of the Comprehensive Plan is to "Identify, preserve, and enhance the cultural resources of Kenmore."

Objective 3.2 of the Comprehensive Plan, under Goal 3, is for the preservation of significant historic and archaeological sites and structures.

- The City could develop an historic structure ordinance and other programs to promote historic and cultural education and recognition.

Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

No significant unavoidable adverse historic or cultural resources impacts are anticipated with implementation of either Alternative 1, No Action, or Alternative 2, Modified Plans, or the Preferred Alternative.

Housing

Affected Environment

Please refer to **Chapter 5, Housing Element**, of this Comprehensive Plan for further background.

- There is a significant "affordability" gap (a lack of housing affordable to persons in at 80 percent of area median income).
- There is a very limited number of vacant multi-family sites available in the City's CDBG eligible tract on which new housing could be constructed.
- The housing stock in Kenmore is in generally good condition, however there are a number of housing units in need of repair.
- Numerous non-profit organizations and a variety of State, Federal, and local programs are available to help meet the housing needs of persons unable to obtain housing without assistance.
- Transportation and traffic issues are of great concern to Kenmore residents and make access to services and employment challenging.

- There are several major providers of services to Kenmore residents operating in the area who would like to expand services in Kenmore but are unable, due to the lack of affordable and suitable space in the City.
- There is a need for recreational spaces and for public spaces for the delivery of service in Kenmore.

Impacts

- **Dwelling Units.** There would be an increase in both single-family and multi-family dwellings as a result of implementing either Alternative 1, No Action, or 2, Modified Plans, or the Preferred Alternative, as shown in **Table ENV-I**.

**TABLE ENV-I
DWELLING UNIT INCREASES
(CITY AND STUDY AREAS)**

USE	1999 LAND USE SURVEY	NET 2020 CITYWIDE ALT. 1	NET 2020 CITYWIDE ALT. 2	NET 2020 CITYWIDE PREF. ALT.	TOTAL 2020 CITYWIDE ALT. 1	TOTAL 2020 CITYWIDE ALT. 2	TOTAL CITYWIDE PREF. ALT.
Single-Family Dwellings	5,706	1,900	1,800	1,793	7,606	7,506	7,499
Multi-Family Dwellings	2,820	3,808	4,430	4,314	6,628	7,250	7,134

Source: Bucher, Willis & Ratliff Corporation

Under any of the Alternatives, new multi-family dwelling units would be added primarily in central Kenmore as part of the redevelopment of commercial areas to mixed-use developments. It is assumed that these units would be attached townhouses or flats. As Alternative 2 or the Preferred Alternative addresses more area for redevelopment, due to the redesignation of industrial lands to mixed-use designations, these would add more attached dwellings than Alternative 1.

Tables **ENV-J and K** shows the contribution of different types of development areas to the total number of units:

**TABLE ENV-J
NET INCREASE IN SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLINGS BY LAND TYPE**

LAND TYPE	ALT. 1 SINGLE-FAMILY	ALT. 1 % OF TOTAL	ALT. 2 SINGLE-FAMILY	ALT. 2 % OF TOTAL	PREFERRED ALT.	PREFERRED ALT. % OF TOTAL
Vacant	752	39.57%	752	41.77%	745	41.55%
Parcels greater than 1 acre and less than \$10,000 in improvement value	119	6.26%	119	6.60%	119	6.64%
Partially developed single-	825	43.44%	725	40.29%	725	40.44%

LAND TYPE	ALT. 1 SINGLE- FAMILY	ALT. 1 % OF TOTAL	ALT. 2 SINGLE- FAMILY	ALT. 2 % OF TOTAL	PREFERRED ALT.	PREFERRED ALT. % OF TOTAL
family parcels that are 4 times the minimum lot size or greater						
Single-family dwellings proposed in applications in the “pipeline”	204	10.74%	204	11.33%	204	11.38%
TOTAL	1900	100%	1,800	99.99%	1,793	100.01%

Source: Bucher, Willis & Ratliff Corporation

TABLE ENV-K
NET INCREASE IN MULTI-FAMILY DWELLINGS BY LAND TYPE

LAND TYPE	ALT. 1 MULTI- FAMILY	ALT. 1 % OF TOTAL	ALT. 2 MULTI- FAMILY	ALT. 2 % OF TOTAL	PREFERRED ALT.	PREFERRED ALT. % OF TOTAL
Vacant	127	3.34%	127	2.87%	115	2.67%
Parcels greater than 1 acre and less than \$10,000 in improvement value	239	6.27%	239	5.39%	239	5.54%
Parcels zoned for multi-family uses that do not have multi-family dwellings currently	448	11.77%	448	10.11%	448	10.38%
Development of Park & Ride as a Transit Oriented Development including park and ride, multi-family and commercial uses	247	6.50%	119	2.69%	119	2.76%
Multi-family dwellings occurring on mobile home park sites	203	5.33%	257⁷	5.80%	298	6.90%
Downtown Areas B and C (excluding units in TOD's and Pipeline which	911	23.93%	1,488	33.58%	1,343	31.13%

⁷ The net increase in dwellings does not include multi-family units occurring in the Downtown Concept C area of Alternative 2.

LAND TYPE	ALT. 1 MULTI- FAMILY	ALT. 1 % OF TOTAL	ALT. 2 MULTI- FAMILY	ALT. 2 % OF TOTAL	PREFERRED ALT.	PREFERRED ALT. % OF TOTAL
address Area A in both Alternatives, and part of Area B in Alternative 1.)						
Pipeline	257	6.75%	257	5.80%	257	5.96%
Bastyr Dorms	175	4.60%	175	3.95%	175	4.06%
LakePointe	1,200	31.52%	1,200	27.09%	1200	27.82%
Future expansion – LakePointe vicinity			120	2.71%	120	2.78%
TOTAL (Rounded)	3,807	100.01%	4,430	99.99%	4,314	100%

Source: Bucher, Willis & Ratliff Corporation

Under either Alternative 1 or 2 or the Preferred Alternative, single-family dwellings would be added on vacant lands and on partially developed lands where there are single-family homes on large lots that can be further subdivided. Areas where there is more vacant or partially developed land include northeast Kenmore. Under Alternative 1, more units would be provided at the location of Bastyr University where the land is zoned for single-family residential units. Additional dormitory units are also possible. Under Alternative 2, the Public/Private Institution classification would prevent single-family dwelling units. With the Preferred Alternative, the Special Study Area overlay district applied to the St. Thomas Seminary (Bastyr) will require master planning in consideration of environmental features and long-term goals of institutional and joint public use. However, it is anticipated that dormitory rooms could be added under Alternative 2 or the Preferred Alternative.

Overall, single-family dwellings will continue to dominate Kenmore in terms of the amount of land devoted to single-family versus multi-family dwellings. In terms of unit potential, the ratio of single-family to multi-family units would change, but single-family uses will remain the majority:

Existing: 67 percent single-family, 33 percent multi-family

Alternative 1: 53 percent single-family, 47 percent multi-family

Alternative 2: 51 percent single-family, 49 percent multi-family

Preferred Alternative: 51 percent single-family, 49percent multi-family.

- **Housing Policy – Location.** In terms of housing policies, the differences between the three Alternatives include the following, as shown in **Table ENV-L**

**TABLE ENV-L
HOUSING POLICY COMPARISONS**

POLICY ALTERNATIVE 1	POLICY ALTERNATIVE 2	PREFERRED POLICY ALTERNATIVE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Range of single-family and multi-family densities, with minimum densities in zones with 4 or more units. (However, there is a discrepancy between the policies and the Interim Zoning Code. The City's Interim Zoning Code does not apply minimum density requirements in the R-4, R-6 and R-8 zones.) Encouragement of mixed-uses in commercial and office areas. Density bonuses offered in residential (more than 4 units), commercial and office zones. Density bonuses encouraged for affordable housing, energy conservation, historic preservation and parks/open space. Encouragement of attached and detached housing in single-family areas. Promotion of scattered site multi-family where possible. Establishment of County housing programs, and coordination with State and Federal agencies to facilitate affordable housing. Mobile home parks encouraged to be retained. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Range of single-family and multi-family densities. Minimum density applied zones with 12 or more units. Encouragement of mixed-uses in commercial and office areas, with particular attention to Downtown. Density bonuses offered in residential, commercial, and office zones. Density bonuses encouraged for affordable housing, additional pervious surface, parks/open space. In Downtown density bonuses offered for shared/structured parking and for lot consolidation. A density bonus is added in R-1 that may only be transferred offsite. Downtown identified as density receiving area for offsite density transfers. Single-family predominance in single-family zones. Concentration of multi-family in Downtown or along arterials. Mobile home parks may be retained, but due to economic life of mobile homes, potential conversion may occur. Promotion of programs to help fund relocation into nearby affordable housing. Support for County programs, and coordination with State and Federal agencies to facilitate affordable housing. Also, identification of local role in promoting housing for all economic segments. 	<p>Same as Alternative 2, with the following refinements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Creation of two sub-elements to emphasize important policies: Residential Neighborhoods and Affordable Housing Sub-Elements. Clarification that housing for persons with special needs can apply to any income level.

Source: Bucher, Willis & Ratliff Corporation

Alternative 1 would potentially affect the character of single-family neighborhoods by promoting scattered-site multi-family developments. In Alternative 1, multi-family and townhouse development are options in single-family areas, along with accessory dwelling units. Alternative 2 or the Preferred Alternative would concentrate multi-family uses primarily in the Downtown. Single-family uses would be the predominant use in the single-family zones, although Alternative 2 or the Preferred Alternative would support the continuation of accessory dwelling unit allowances in single-family areas. Unlike Alternative 1, multi-family and townhouse development would not be options in single-family areas with Alternative 2 or the Preferred Alternative.

Alternative 1 applies multi-family designations to mobile home parks (R-12), which may result in their conversion over time as land values increase. However, the policies would support mobile home retention.

Alternative 2 or the Preferred Alternative also apply multi-family designations to mobile home parks, which may result in their conversion over time as land values increase. In Alternative 2, Downtown Concept C would allow for mixed-use development in an area with mobile home parks (RB and R-24). If Concept C is the location for future additional mixed-use development, it may result in pressure for higher densities in other nearby mobile home parks. The Preferred Alternative reclassifies the mobile home parks on NE 175th near Concept C to be R-24 instead of R-12, the existing classification. However, due to soil conditions and other environmental constraints, there may be pressure for higher density uses in the area southeast of Bothell Way to allow for clustering and to make economical building construction types that account for difficult soil conditions. Whether mobile home parks are located in the Downtown or not, housing policies would allow retention of mobile home parks, but recognize that most of the units in the mobile home parks could become obsolete, and that relocation assistance should be provided, including monetary assistance and preferential location in nearby affordable dwelling units.

- **Growth Targets.** The City's 1992-2012 growth target established by the King County Countywide Planning Policies is a range of 974-1,190 households with a mid-point of 1,082 households. On an annualized basis, this would mean that 50 to 60 units would need to be provided each year within Kenmore. Assuming 60 households would require housing each year through the year 2020, the life of the plan, one could determine the maximum 1992-2020 household target to equal 1,680 households. Any of the land use alternatives studied would provide enough zoned capacity, and a more than sufficient market cushion, to exceed the 2012 and 2020 household target.

King County Countywide Planning Policies require that between 20-24 percent of units be affordable to very low-income households, and 17 percent be affordable to low income households. Any Alternative would add sufficient quantities of single-family and multi-family dwellings to exceed total household targets and provide a sufficient market cushion. Attached dwellings, whether rental or condominium, are often more affordable than single-family detached dwellings, and the three Alternatives would provide multi-family dwellings, particularly in central Kenmore and along arterials where there would be more access to regional transit as well as commercial and governmental services.

- **Affordable Housing Programs.** Generally, to help meet affordable housing needs, all Alternatives support a range of housing programs, including support of Federal, State and Regional housing assistance programs. Alternative 2 or the Preferred Alternative policies are more tailored to the City of Kenmore and are based on a Community Housing and Human Services Needs Assessment prepared by Common Ground in Spring 2000. A range of City actions are defined.

Mitigation

- Comprehensive Plan Goal 26 would "Promote and maintain strong residential neighborhoods."

Objective 26.1: "Encourage repair and maintenance of existing housing."

Objective 26.2: "Promote safe, physically accessible, well maintained, and well designed residential environments with associated open spaces."

Objective 26.4: "Identify and support Kenmore's Downtown as a center for commercial, civic, cultural, park, and higher density housing uses and activities."

- Goal 27 is to “provide housing opportunities in Kenmore for people with special needs.”

Objective 27.1: “Provide opportunities for the development of emergency, transitional, and permanent housing for people with special needs.”

Objective 27.2 “Develop and promote community facilities and programs that are important to the safety, health, and social needs of families, children and persons with special needs.”

- Comprehensive Plan Goal 28 is to “Integrate low income housing into the Kenmore community.”

Objective 28.1: “Encourage retention of the existing housing stock in Kenmore as a source of affordable housing.”

Objective 28.2: “Strive to meet the city’s growth targets and affordable housing needs.”

Objective 28.3: “Provide zoning and development standards that allow for affordable housing types that can be compatibly integrated into the community.

Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

No significant unavoidable adverse housing are anticipated. See **Land Use Plans** regarding policy conflicts.

Transportation

Affected Environment

Please refer to **Chapter 6, Transportation Element**, of this Comprehensive Plan for further background information related to transportation. Basic findings include:

- The largest traffic volumes in the City of Kenmore occur along the SR-522 corridor during the PM peak hour. Several intersections exceed Level of Service E or F on SR-522 and on Juanita Drive. There is a significant amount of pass-through traffic in the community.
- Accidents on several of Kenmore’s arterials exceed the average accident rate for similar roadways. Future Transportation Improvement Programs (TIP’s) will need to address safety concerns.
- There are very few sidewalks within the City of Kenmore. Several arterial corridors have been identified as lacking sidewalks.

Impacts

Similar traffic improvements have been tested for the three land use Alternatives, 1, 2, and the Preferred. Unless noted, the following impacts apply to any of the Alternatives:

- **Construction.** To accommodate growth under any Alternative, there are multi-million dollar new construction projects proposed as part of the Transportation Element. Construction will result in increased noise, dust and glare, as well as delays in the normal flow of traffic. In addition, roadway expansion projects will result in an increase in impervious surface.
- **Property Acquisition.** Any of the Alternatives would require road improvements involving property acquisition. Improvements to Juanita Drive N., 61st Avenue NE, and 80th Avenue NE may result in

the need for additional right-of-way (ROW) along each corridor, which will be determined in the design phase. In addition, the extension of NE 141st Street will result in a need for ROW acquisition. The potential extension of 83rd Place NE to NE 170th may result in both acquisition and relocation, but this is not applicable to the Preferred Alternative.

- **Access.** The long-term improvements to SR-522 will result in the elimination of left turns to and from adjacent properties in many cases. In addition, left turns will be eliminated to and from 68th Avenue NE at NE 175th Street.
- **Level of Service.** **Table ENV-M** summarizes the level of service (LOS) and stop delay anticipated at fourteen major locations in the City of Kenmore. The table includes listings of both level of service and stopped delay for the model forecast years (1999, 2006 and 2020). **Table ENV-M** results are based upon a Citywide model that is calibrated to approximate current conditions, and for each time period and improvement, a similar methodology is used to calculate levels of service. Review of the results of **Table ENV-M** shows the relative change in levels of service as a result of various improvements. Each time period model run is described below.

Base Year

The Base Year analysis is based upon the 1999 transportation network along with 1999 land use development. The calibrated model was used to simulate volumes on the transportation network. Levels of service were estimated using modeled volumes. LOS results using modeled volumes approximate LOS results determined with actual count volumes.

2006

There are three model results for the Year 2006:

- **2006 Network.** This model run assumes implementation of a majority of the City's Adopted Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), and included extension of NE 185th Street, SR-522 Improvements (described under the section "Kenmore Current Plans") and LakePointe Way. In terms of land use, the model tested the six-year development levels. Essentially, the six-year development numbers include development of the LakePointe project and six-years of the twenty-year forecasted growth. (Refer to **Appendix A**)
- **2006 No Improvement (except LakePointe Way).** This model run assumes the Base Year network with the addition of LakePointe Way only since the development and its transportation mitigation package have been approved. As with the other 2006 model runs, the six-year development numbers include development of the LakePointe project and six-years of the twenty-year forecasted growth. The purpose of this run is to determine the effects of growth without most improvements.
- **2006 Final Network.** As with the other 2006 model runs, the six-year development numbers include development of the LakePointe project and six-years of the twenty-year forecasted growth. This model run assumes the Base Year network, Year 2006 Network, plus additional improvements recommended through the modeling and level of service analysis contained in the Draft Integrated Comprehensive Plan and EIS. The Final Network improvements are listed on **Table T-R of Chapter 6**.

TABLE ENV-M
LEVEL OF SERVICE (LOS) SUMMARY - ALTERNATIVES

Pivot Node	Node No.	Intersection	Traffic Control ¹	Peak Hour	Base Year, 1999 (Count Volumes)		Base Year, 1999 (Forecasted Volumes)		2006 Network		2006, No Improvement		2006, Final Network		2020, LU1		2020, LU2		2020, LU1, Ultimate		2020, LU2, Ultimate		2020, LU3, No Improvement		2020, LU3, Final Network	
					Delay ³	LOS ⁴	Delay ³	LOS ⁴	Delay ³	LOS ⁴	Delay ³	LOS ⁴	Delay ³	LOS ⁴	Delay ³	LOS ⁴	Delay ³	LOS ⁴	Delay ³	LOS ⁴	Delay ³	LOS ⁴	Delay ³	LOS ⁴	Delay ³	LOS ⁴
1	120	SR 522 @ 83rd Place NE	TWSC/S ²	P.M.	235.9	F	213.6	F	1452.6	F	1452.4	F	1452.4	F	339.9	F	368.5	F	485.4	F	491.3	F	3341.1	F	112.9	F
2	119	SR 522 @ 80th Avenue NE	S	P.M.	44.0	D	44.8	D	89.7	F	100.7	F	57.4	E	443.5	F	433.5	F	143.2	F	162.3	F	490.8	F	291.2	F
3	108	SR 522 @ 73rd Avenue NE	S	P.M.	44.9	D	109.3	F	34.9	C	101.8	F	27.3	C	340.1	F	378.2	F	183.1	F	190.2	F	ECL ⁹	F	345.0	F
4	107	SR 522 @ 68th Avenue NE	S	P.M.	ECL ⁹	F	254.1	F	79.0	E	256.0	F	74.0	E	413.1	F	494.5	F	162.7	F	170.0	F	ECL ⁹	F	101.6	F
5	78	SR 522 @ 61st Avenue NE	S	P.M.	285.9	F	265.7	F	300.5	F	310.7	F	44.7	D	ECL ⁹	F	ECL ⁹	F	248.3	F	215.1	F	ECL ⁹	F	212.7	F
6	270	Simonds Road NE @ NE 155th Street	S	P.M.	13.2	B	13.5	B	28.0	C	29.3	C	7.4	A	29.7	C	34.8	C	18.2	B	19.6	B	225.0	F	8.9	A
7	151	Simonds Road NE @ 84th Avenue NE	TWSC/S ^{2, 12}	P.M.	24.6 ⁵ / 23.4 ⁶	C ⁵ / C ⁶	110.1 ⁵ / 18.8 ⁶	F ⁵ / C ⁶	1,497.6 ⁵ / 28.3 ⁶	F ⁵ / D ⁶	1556.9 ⁵ / 28.6 ⁶	F ⁵ / D ⁶	8.6	A	697.3	F	746.6	F	359	F	402.6	F	6556.9 ⁵ / 54.7 ⁶	F ⁵ / F ⁶	9.9	A
8	193	NE 193rd Street @ 61st Avenue NE	TWSC/S ^{10, 12}	P.M.	25.3	D	18.0	C	63.5	F	74.2	F	7.5	A	947.9	F	1,150.0	F	10.5	B	10.8	B	1718.4	F	11.0	B
9	112	NE 185th Street @ 68th Avenue NE	TWSC/S ¹²	P.M.	16.9 ⁷ / 13.1 ⁸	C ⁷ / B ⁸	33.7 ⁷ / 17.9 ⁸	D ⁷ / C ⁸	26.2 ⁷ / 28.5 ⁸	D ⁷ / D ⁸	30.4 ⁷ / 17.2 ⁸	D ⁷ / C ⁸	12.0	B	1,444.2 ⁷ / 1,528.7 ⁸	F ⁷ / F ⁸	3,855.5 ⁷ / 1,912.2 ⁸	F ⁷ / F ⁸	31.5 ⁷ / 140.8 ⁸	D ⁷ / F ⁸	39.2 ⁷ / 360.0 ⁸	E ⁷ / F ⁸	74.4 ⁷ / 68.2 ⁸	F ⁷ / F ⁸	16.0	B
10	133	Juanita Drive @ NE 153rd Place	S	P.M.	16.0	B	13.9	B	20.6	C	21.5	C	8.5	A	24.4	C	26.4	C	16.9	B	17.4	B	125.1	F	9.5	A
11	124	68th Avenue NE @ NE 170th Street	S	P.M.	281.6	F	196.5	F	393.1	F	407.7	F	22.5	C	665.9	F	766.8	F	140.9	F	174.7	F	ECL ⁹	F	76.1	E
12	101	SR 522 @ LakePointe Way	S	P.M.					120.0	F	76.6	E	64.6	E	326.6	F	437.2	F	101.2	F	107.1	F	291.2	F	119.9	F
13	281	68th Ave. NE @ LakePointe Way	S	P.M.					47.1	D	134.4	F	23.2	C	57.0	E	57.3	E	151.8	F	259	F	301.1	F	60.6	E
14	129	83rd Place NE @ NE 170th Street	S	P.M.															267.8	F	271.5	F				
15	169	84th Avenue NE @ NE 145th Street	TWSC	P.M.	11.4 ⁷ / 12.9 ⁸	B ⁷ / B ⁸																				
16	138	84th Avenue NE @ NE 155th Street	AWSC	P.M.	8.6	A																				
17	**	73rd Avenue NE @ North City Limit	AWSC	P.M.	12.3	B																				
18	111	68th Avenue NE @ NE 175th Street	S	P.M.	18.1	B																				
19	259	Simonds Road NE @ 92nd Avenue NE	TWSC/S ¹²	P.M.	17.2 ¹¹	C ¹¹							7.8	A											8.3	A

1. S = signalized intersection, TWSC = two-way stop-controlled intersection, AWSC = all-way stop-controlled intersection.
2. TWSC/S = This is a two-way stop-controlled intersection (at minor leg) at base year and year of 2006, and will be upgraded to a signalized intersection in year 2020.
3. Delay is measured in seconds per vehicle. At signalized intersections, delay is based on the average control delay reported for the entire intersection. Delay at TWSC intersections is based on average control delay for the minor movement(s). Delay at AWSC intersections is based on average control delay of the intersection.
4. LOS is the Level of Service based on the methodology outlined in the 1997 Highway Capacity Manual.
5. Approach delay and LOS for northbound traffic (minor street) at this intersection.
6. Approach delay and LOS for southbound traffic (minor street) at this intersection.
7. Approach delay and LOS for westbound traffic (minor street) at this intersection.
8. Approach delay and LOS for eastbound traffic (minor street) at this intersection.
9. ECL = exceeds calculable limits.
10. TWSC/S = This intersection will be upgraded to a signalized intersection for the "2020 Ultimate" alternative.
11. This information is provided by the Gibson Traffic Consultants (GTC) in a report titled "Supplementary Traffic Analysis for Mooeland Ridge; 75th Ave. NE; Kenmore".
12. TWSC/S = This is a two-way stop-controlled intersection (at minor leg) at base year, and will be upgraded to a signalized intersection for the "2006, Final Network" and "2020, LU3, Final Network" alternatives.
- Note: Intersections 15 through 18 are presented for the Base Year as they were determined to be intersections that the City may wish to monitor over time. At the time of the model preparation, they were not considered intersections that were critical to analyze in the model. Intersection 19 is in an area where infill development is occurring and improvements are proposed.

Source: Bucher, Willis & Ratliff Corporation

Changes on an intersection by intersection basis occur, over this period. As would be expected, traffic volumes continue to increase, with associated impacts on Kenmore intersections. However, a few intersections actually show operational improvements during this period, including SR-522 as a result of the substantial investment Kenmore is making in SR-522 related projects.

The year 2006 LOS indicates the intersection of SR-522 and 73rd Avenue NE improves from LOS F⁸ to LOS C, with stopped delay time decreasing from 109 seconds to 27 seconds. The intersection of SR-522 and 68th Avenue NE improves from LOS F to LOS E, with stopped delay time improving from 254 seconds to 74 seconds.

The results indicate that without improvement, levels of service will decrease, and would not be completely solved by the Year 2006 Network originally studied in the Draft Plan/EIS. However, with the 2006 Final Network model run, intersections would meet the proposed LOS standards listed on **Figure T-8 of Chapter 6**.

2020

For the year 2020, several model runs were completed to test three land use alternatives and various network improvements, as follows:

- 2020 LU1. This model run also tests future development on the Base Year network and the Year 2006 Network. The land use assumptions are based upon Alternative 1, Current Kenmore Zoning Map (No Action), reviewed in the Draft Integrated Comprehensive Plan and EIS, and not adopted with this Final Integrated Comprehensive Plan and EIS.
- 2020 LU2. This model run also tests future development on the Base Year network and the Year 2006 Network. The land use assumptions are based upon Alternative 2, Modified Plans, reviewed in the Draft Integrated Comprehensive Plan and EIS, and not adopted with this Final Integrated Comprehensive Plan and EIS.
- 2020 LU1 Ultimate. This model run also tests future development on the Base Year network and the Year 2006 Network, and three major changes to the network:
 - Extend 83rd place NE south of SR-522 on a southwesterly diagonal to connect with NE 170th Street (requiring a new bridge over the Sammamish River)
 - Construct a new east/west route somewhere north of the City
 - Convert the current transit only lanes to HOV lanes
- 2020 LU2 Ultimate. This model run also tests future development on the Base Year network and the Year 2006 Network, and three major changes to the network identified for 2020 LU1 Ultimate.
- 2020 LU3, No Improvement. This model run tests the Preferred Alternative land use plan with only the Base Year network and LakePointe Way. The land use development levels are consistent with Kenmore Land Use Map, **Figure LU-3 of Chapter 4A** adopted in this Final Integrated Comprehensive Plan and EIS. The purpose of this model run is to determine the effects of future growth without most improvements.

⁸ All measures are model derived.

- 2020 LU3, Final Network. Finally, this model run tests the Preferred Alternative (Kenmore Land Use Map, **Figure LU-3 of Chapter 4A**) with the final network recommended in **Tables T-K and T-R of Chapter 6**. The major improvement assumed is the construction of a new east/west route somewhere north of the City.

Reviewing the results for the 2020 model runs, as Kenmore and the region continue to grow and develop, traffic increases continue to exacerbate travel delays through the City. *Without improvement*, by the year 2020, all major intersections fail (LOS F). These results generally apply for any land use alternative, and through traffic remains in relative proportion to current conditions. Based upon these results, it appears that major development in Kenmore, which is anticipated to be on or near SR-522, will contribute to a continued worsening of delay, but that growth outside of Kenmore will probably remain a substantial part of this problem.

The 2020 LU1 Ultimate and LU2 Ultimate model run results show improvement. However, the proposed LOS standards shown on Figure T-8 would not be met in the following instances:

- Simonds Road NE and 84th Avenue NE
- NE 185th Street and 68th Avenue NE
- 68th Avenue NE and NE 170th Street
- 68th Avenue NE and LakePointe Way
- 83rd Place NE and NE 170th Street.

In the Draft Integrated Comprehensive Plan and EIS, it was determined that the elimination of the 83rd Place NE extension would correct three of the five LOS deficiencies by eliminating the flow of traffic that is avoiding the SR-522 / 68th Avenue NE and SR-522 / 73rd Avenue intersections. It was also determined that the deficiency at NE 185th Street and 68th Avenue NE should be resolved by construction of a new traffic signal, and that adding one lane should resolve the LOS deficiency at Simonds Road NE and 84th Avenue NE.

Based on these results and upon the public review of the Draft Integrated Comprehensive Plan and EIS, it was determined that the 83rd Place bridge project should be eliminated as it did not provide congestion relief, and its environmental and monetary costs were too high. To preserve the SR-522 transit-only lanes and increase transit options, the potential for converting the transit-only lanes to HOV lanes for buses and carpools was also eliminated. Instead, the primary improvement was determined to be a new east-west corridor near the northern City limits. A series of other network improvements were also proposed as a result of the modeling analysis, and are listed on **Table T-R of Chapter 6**. Testing the approved Kenmore Land Use Plan (also known as LU3 or the Preferred Alternative), with this final network resulted in intersections achieving the proposed LOS standards (see **Figure T-8, Chapter 6**). It should be noted that SR-522 would remain highly congested with LOS F at several locations, but this roadway is exempt from local LOS and concurrency requirements as it is a Highway of Statewide Significance. In comparison with 1999 levels of service, some delay time on SR-522 would decrease by 2020 (e.g. SR-522 at 61st Avenue NE, SR-522 at 83rd Place) although remaining at LOS F. Essentially, the community would “hold its own” in the PM peak hour despite increasing volumes, and during the off-peak hours would see significant improvement.

Mitigation

Citywide/Downtown

A variety of transportation options will be utilized to mitigate impacts of the proposed land use alternatives in the Comprehensive Plan, including:

- Construction of transportation projects as listed in the **Transportation Element**.
- Acquisition and relocation of properties in accordance with local, state and federal standards.
- Construction of a median along SR-522, but with simultaneous construction of U-Turn facilities on SR-522 to improve property access.
- Construction of a dedicated right-turn lane on 68th Avenue NE, southbound between NE 175th Street and LakePointe Way to improve property access to and from properties on NE 175th Street, west of 68th Avenue NE.
- Completion of the “Downtown Loop” to improve local circulation and access to properties along the current NE 175th Street, east of 68th Avenue NE.
- Implementation of a financing program that includes a revised transportation impact fee system and appropriate SEPA mitigation for specific improvements not covered in the impact fee system (with the intent that development “pays its own way”).
- Construction of a sidewalk system throughout the community, but as prioritized in accordance with the Transportation Element.
- Implementation of appropriate design standards that deal with the loss of pervious surface resulting from construction of new roadways.
- Goal 29 of the Comprehensive Plan is to “Develop an efficient, safe, and environmentally sensitive road system that supports desired development patterns.”

Objective 29.1: “Provide an integrated street network of different classes of streets designed to facilitate different types of traffic flows and access needs.”

Objective 29.2: “Develop design standards for all classifications of Kenmore streets.”

Objective 29.3: “Design streets to accommodate some specialized vehicles and non-motorized modes of transportation.”

Objective 29.4: “Design and maintain streets consistent with the community vision.”

Objective 29.5: “Improve street safety and functions.”

Objective 29.6: “Cooperate regionally and strive locally to improve air quality and surface water quality.”

- Goal 30 is to “Provide a safe and convenient neighborhood access system that respects community needs and values.”

Objective 30.1: “Ensure adequate and safe access to property.”

Objective 30.2: “Evaluate and mitigate the impacts of development on the transportation system.”

Objective 30.3: “Promote the continuity of the street pattern and design when considering subdivision, street vacation, or street extension proposals.”

Objective 30.4: “Develop through routes and access to main roads while protecting local neighborhood circulation.”

- Goal 31 is to “Establish and maintain a level of service consistent with local and regional circulation needs.”

Objective 31.1: “Adopt levels of service for roads that allow the City to effectively manage regional and local traffic.”

Objective 31.2: “Coordinate with park-and-ride and transit service providers in establishing appropriate levels of service for the community.”

Objective 31.3: “Develop a transportation system that recognizes regional traffic needs while allowing Kenmore to meet economic development goals.”

Objective 31.4 “Review and monitor the transportation system to provide adequate service to existing and future land uses.”

Objective 31.5: “Ensure that transportation improvements or strategies are constructed or financed concurrently with development.”

- Goal 32 is to “Coordinate with local, regional, state, and federal agencies in the development and operation of the transportation system.”

Objective 32.1: “Support and complement the transportation functions of the State of Washington, transit agencies, and other entities responsible for transportation facilities and services in the Kenmore area to meet Kenmore’s needs.”

Objective 32.2: “Cooperate with neighboring cities, King and Snohomish Counties, transit agencies, Puget Sound Regional Council, and the Washington State Department of Transportation to address regional transportation issues.”

Objective 32.3: “Ensure regional transportation improvements and services are compatible with the Comprehensive Plan and realize the Vision Statement of the community.”

- Goal 33 is to “Promote responsible funding of needed transportation system improvements with public and private sector participation.”

Objective 33.1: “Prioritize circulation system improvements needed to address safety, maintenance, congestion relief, multi-modal projects, transit, and growth.”

Objective 33.2: “Regularly prepare and adopt a six-year transportation improvement program to implement the Transportation Element.”

Objective 33.3: “Leverage City resources and secure adequate funding sources for transportation improvements and services through a variety of mechanisms.”

Objective 33.4: “Require new development to contribute its fair share towards transportation improvements and services required due to the development.”

- Goal 34 is to “Support public transportation and reduce the need for automobile travel.”

Objective 34.1: “Support expansion of local and regional transit service within Kenmore that provides linkages to regional destinations.”

Objective 34.2: “Create a transit system that allows for intra-city linkages through a partnership with transit agencies.”

Objective 34.3: “Work with King County and transit agencies to provide appropriate locations and encourage maximum usage of park-and-ride facilities.”

Objective 34.4: “Explore public/private partnerships to create joint-use of park-and-ride lots.”

Objective 34.5: “Promote pedestrian and street system improvements on SR-522 that connect to the transit system.”

- Goal 35 is to “Establish a non-motorized circulation system linking key community destinations.”

Objective 35.1: “Create a sidewalk and pedestrian trail network linking neighborhoods, Downtown, and key community destinations.”

Objective 35.2: “Create a comprehensive network of bicycle facilities in Kenmore.”

Objective 35.3: “Identify appropriate locations where safe equestrian access will be preserved, enhanced, or added.”

- Goal 36 is to “Maintain the availability of safe air travel services in Kenmore.”

Objective 36.1: “Support the continued operation of the Air Harbor to provide private air transportation services to the region and community.”

Objective 36.2: “Plan for appropriate uses and activities in the vicinity to minimize impacts to and from the Air Harbor.”

Objective 36.3: “Work with the Air Harbor to ensure compliance with appropriate noise and safety standards.”

- Goal 37 is to “Encourage transportation strategies to reduce the use of single-occupant vehicles (SOV).”

Objective 37.1: “Promote high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes for use by transit.”

Objective 37.2: “Promote land use development which encourages transit usage, non-single-occupant vehicle (non-SOV) travel, and pedestrian and bicycle movement.”

Objective 37.3: “Implement programs and regulations that help reduce the use of single-occupant vehicles (SOV).”

Objective 37.4: “Ensure mobility for all modes of travel east and west, north and south.”

Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

There would be an increase in traffic on all roads discussed in this section with more traffic associated with Alternative 2 than the Preferred Alternative or Alternative 1. To the extent feasible, mitigation measures (road improvements and demand management strategies) have been included to improve future levels of service or maintain a similar amount of delay during the PM peak hour. It is likely that future levels of service on NE Bothell Way (SR-522) will continue to be at LOS F. However, concurrency requirements would not apply to NE Bothell Way, a Highway of Statewide Significance, per the Growth Management Act.

Noise

Affected Environment

Please refer to the 1999 Draft Kenmore Comprehensive Plan Inventory for further background. Basic findings include:

- Although there are federal and state guidelines and standards, noise-related criteria most relevant to the City of Kenmore is that included in the King County Noise Ordinance, adopted by Kenmore in 1998 and amended through ordinance number 98-0042.
- In some locations, such as the residential areas on the hill north of NE Bothell Way and the LakePointe site, EPA, FHWA, and HUD noise guidelines/standards are currently exceeded. If federally-funded housing were proposed for NE Bothell Way, it would not currently meet U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) noise standards as a residential receiver.
- Existing ambient sound levels are generally consistent with the King County daytime noise standards when accounting for Code exemptions (for example, traffic noise).
- Seaplane noise levels at some waterfront residences and at Logboom Park exceed current daytime noise regulations for taxiing watercraft.
- Major noise sources in Kenmore would continue to include traffic, aircraft, construction, and other industrial noise sources. In particular, traffic represents the major noise source found in the community. Future noise levels would increase where traffic levels increase.

Impacts

- Increased population due to additional development or redevelopment would result in additional traffic in the immediate vicinity and an increase in noise levels from vehicles. Redevelopment under Alternative 1 would result in an estimated 186,800 total daily trips that would impact local noise levels. Alternative 2 would result in a greater level of development, generating an estimated 193,730 total daily trips that would impact local noise levels due to automobiles. The Preferred Alternative would result in an estimated 191,900 total daily trips, in between the range of Alternatives 1 and 2. Roadway traffic noise is exempt in State, County, and City noise ordinances. Noise increases on SR-522 would exacerbate current conditions which do not currently meet HUD noise standards. If

federally funded housing were proposed for SR-522, it would not meet HUD noise standards as a residential receiver, either currently or in the future.

- Alternative 2 or the Preferred Alternative would eliminate the Industrial classification, and existing or future noise from industrial uses would decrease over time. Alternative 1 would maintain the Industrial classification.
- As development occurs, short-term noise impacts could result from construction activity and equipment.
- Additional growth in seaplane activity at the Air Harbor could increase local noise impacts to nearby residents, or if additional residential development occurs near the Air Harbor, additional persons could be exposed to seaplane noise.

Mitigation

- Objective 13.2 “Encourage a reduction in overall noise levels throughout the community.”
 - Policy LU-13.2.1: “Require new developments which could generate substantial levels of noise or could expose people to substantial levels of noise from existing noise generators to submit an analysis of potential noise impacts and propose mitigation.”
 - Policy LU-13.2.2: “Implement noise and nuisance ordinances to address various noise sources and require cessation or mitigation of noise.”
 - Policy LU-13.2.3: “Encourage residential or other noise-sensitive development proposed for location in noise-impacted areas to be oriented away from noise source, or to be constructed with materials that will maximize noise reductions, or to incorporate fencing, landscaping, or other noise-reducing features, appropriate to the situation. Noise impacted areas may include the vicinity of SR-522, or the vicinity of the Air Harbor, or other areas that may be determined through environmental review.”
- Policy T-36.3.1: “Work in partnership with the Air Harbor to address noise management and compliance with Federal, State and local noise ordinances.”
- Policy T-36.2.2 would in part, have the City “...consider a special overlay or property title process that identifies the noise-related impacts of the Air Harbor.”

Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

Noise levels will increase in the Planning Area from short-term and long-term noise sources. Short-term noise sources such as construction and seaplane taxiing noise levels are addressed through adopted noise ordinances. Long-term noise level increases from traffic could increase on major roadways in Kenmore, and generally is exempt from regulations. New residential development could be designed and constructed to minimize interior noise levels. However, increased exterior noise levels from increased traffic would be more difficult to mitigate.

Utilities

Affected Environment

Please refer to **Chapter 10, Utilities**, of this Comprehensive Plan for further background information. Basic findings include:

- Electric utility service for the City of Kenmore is provided by Puget Sound Energy (PSE). Within Kenmore, PSE has 7,900 electric customers as of September 30, 1999.
- According to plans for the Northshore Subarea, future power facility construction within Kenmore before 2020 will include additional transmission lines and two new substations.
- Natural gas utility services for the City of Kenmore is provided by Puget Sound Energy (PSE). Within Kenmore, PSE has 4,013 gas customers as of August 1999.
- PSE has 55 miles of gas mains within Kenmore. Most of the streets within the Study Area contain gas mains. The largest gaps in gas service occur along portions of 80th Avenue NE north of NE Bothell Way.
- Based on current growth predictions, PSE has identified one major project within the Study Area to be completed before 2020. This proposed improvement would consist of installing a 12-inch diameter high-pressure gas mains in NE 145th Street between 84th Avenue NE and the eastern City Limits.
- Telephone service is provided within the entire Study Area by GTE. GTE does not have any fixed cellular facilities within the city boundary, nor does it have major projects planned for the near future.
- Metricom, Nextel and AT&T, among others, have or are planning on installing cellular facilities in the community.
- TV cable service is provided within the entire Study Area by AT&T Cable Services to 4,683 cable customers within Kenmore. AT&T has been in the process of a system upgrade between Olympia and Bellingham to provide a “universal line-up” whereby the region will receive the same channels and programming.

Impacts

- Under Alternative 1, No Action, Kenmore’s population is anticipated to be approximately 30,352 residents by 2020. Assuming the Planning Area, the future population would equal 34,162. Additional population and employment growth will result in additional demand placed upon energy, telecommunication, and cable service facilities. Private utilities cited above have created electronic modeling and growth plans to accommodate future load growth.
- Under Alternative 2, Modified Plans, Kenmore’s population is anticipated to be approximately 31,606 residents by 2020. Assuming the Planning area, the future population would equal 35,414. Alternative 2 would generate additional population and employment growth and would place a higher demand on the services than Alternative 1.
- Under the Preferred Alternative, the population is expected to equal 31,339 in the City limits and 35,119 in the Planning Area, which is between the range of Alternatives 1 and 2.

- Under any Alternative, additional growth will require the installation of new electric, gas, telecommunication, and cable facilities within public rights-of-way, or within privately held utility corridors. The addition of these facilities could result in visual impacts at the locations where they are installed.
- Studies of the health effects of electromagnetic fields caused from electrical lines and appliances is currently inconclusive, and as a result, no specific policies about siting of facilities or right-of-way standards have been implemented. PSE makes efforts in the planning of facilities to avoid persons as much as possible, in part due to aesthetic considerations.

Mitigation

- Comprehensive Plan Goal 50 states: “Ensure that privately provided utilities, including electricity, natural gas, cable television, and communication, are available or can be provided to serve the community.”

Objective 50.1: “Ensure utility providers make improvements and additions to improve service and accommodate growth in a timely manner.”

Policy U-50.1.8 states: “Support the relocation of utility poles to protect the public safety and to further the Comprehensive Plan goals and realization of the Vision Statement.”

Objective 50.2: “Coordinate the timing and location of utilities to minimize cost and disruption.”

Objective 50.3: “Facilitate the provision of reliable utility service in a way that minimizes environmental and safety impacts while allowing for a fair and reasonable price for the utility’s product.”

Objective 50.4: “Encourage undergrounding of overhead utilities and co-location of utilities to reduce aesthetic impacts.”

- Goal 51 is to “Encourage resource and energy conservation.”

Objective 51.3 states “Promote and support energy conservation.”

Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

No significant unavoidable adverse utility impacts are anticipated with implementation of either Alternative 1, No Action, or Alternative 2, Modified Plans, or the Preferred Alternative.

City Facilities

Affected Environment

Please refer to **Chapter 9, Public Services Element**, of this Comprehensive Plan for further background. Basic findings include:

- The City of Kenmore has a council-manager form of government. With the City Manager are 13 full time equivalent (FTE) positions as of January 2001. An additional staff member under contract as Police Chief coordinates public safety resources, but does not have offices at City Hall. In all there are 13 staff persons working at City Hall. At the January 2001 rate, there are about 0.77 regular City employees per 1,000 population, excluding the City Council members.

- City functions are managed in the City Hall building at 6700 NE 181st Street. City Hall includes approximately 4,000 square feet of space, or about 307 square feet per employee (with 13 in-house staff). The City Hall building is anticipated to house City functions for three to five years. City Hall storage space is currently limited, and the City Hall lacks Council Chambers.
- One additional staff positions is budgeted for the year 2001. The space per person, assuming 14 employees, would equal about 286 square feet. At the 2001 rate, there would be about 0.83 regular City employees per 1,000 population, excluding City Council members.

Impacts

- Without changes to zoning and land use in Alternative 1, Kenmore's population is anticipated to be approximately 30,352 residents by 2020. Assuming the Planning Area, the future population would equal 34,162. Within the Planning Area, to maintain the January 2001 city staffing level of 0.77 regular City employees per thousand population, there would need to be about 26 city staff members, a 100 percent increase over the 13-employee level, and a 86 percent increase in employees over the total 14 employees budgeted for the year 2001. To accommodate 26 staff members at 286 square feet per person, the City hall space would need to equal approximately 7,440 square feet. On a per capita basis, this is 0.245 per capita assuming City residents and 0.218 per capita assuming full Planning Area residents.
- Under Alternative 2, Kenmore's population is anticipated to be 31,606. Assuming the Planning Area, the future population would equal 35,414. Within the Planning Area, to maintain the January 2001 city staffing level of 0.77 regular City employees per thousand population, there would need to be about 27 city staff members, a 108 percent increase over the 13-employee level, and a 93 percent increase in employees over the total 14 employees budgeted for the year 2001. To accommodate 27 staff members at the 286 square feet per person, the City Hall space would need to equal approximately 7,720 square feet. On a per capita basis, this is 0.244 per capita assuming City residents and 0.218 per capita assuming full Planning Area residents.
- The Preferred Alternative's Capital Facility Plan assumes construction of a 15,000-square foot City Hall, likely built as part of a Civic Center in the Downtown Concept B area. The size was determined based on a review of other municipal City Halls, and to emphasize its role as a place for meeting facilitation. The square foot per capita would be 0.478 assuming a future City population of 31,339, or 0.427 per capita assuming a future Planning Area population of 35,119.

For comparison purposes with the other Alternatives, if applying the January 2001 employee rate of 0.77, there would need to be 27 City Staff members, a 108 percent increase over the 13-employee level and a 93 percent increase over the Year 2001 budgeted 14-employee level. To accommodate the 27 employees at 286 square feet each, the building size would equal 7,720 square feet; however, the existing ratio does not address the need for City meeting facilities or other factors noted above.

Mitigation

- Comprehensive Plan Goal 43 is to "ensure that city government remains open and responsive to its informed citizenry."

Objective 43.1: "Strengthen communication between government and the people."

Objective 43.2: "Actively seek public involvement."

Objective 43.3: "Promote volunteerism."

- Goal 44 is “Provide efficient municipal services that meet the needs of the community.”

Objective 44.1 “Contract to the great extent possible with public agencies and private providers for the cost-efficient delivery of quality municipal services.”

Objective 44.2: “Provide sufficient resources, staffing, and procedures to provide City-managed services to the community.”

Objective 44.3: “Develop and implement permit processes that are timely, predictable, and fair to all affected parties.”

Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

No significant unavoidable adverse City facility impacts are anticipated with implementation of either Alternative 1, No Action, or Alternative 2, Modified Plans, or the Preferred Alternative.

Fire/Emergency Services

Affected Environment

Please refer to **Chapter 9, Public Services Element**, of this Comprehensive Plan for further background. Basic findings include:

- The Northshore Fire District (FD 16) serves all of the City of Kenmore and the Kenmore-Bothell Joint Study Area. District-wide staffing level at the time of this writing was equal to one firefighter per 917 persons.
- The number of aid calls has generally increased each year between 1986 to 1998 with medical aid calls representing the majority. Recent information for the Year 2000 continues this trend. In 1998, response times ranged from 2.8 to 6.8 minutes depending on location within Kenmore City limits.
- The Northshore Fire District does not currently have critical equipment or facility repair needs.
- The Northshore Fire District continues to hire as many firefighters as can be afforded to meet State and Federal guidelines. While guidelines suggest a minimum of 13, the District staffing is between 9 and 11 firefighters per shift. Shortfalls in the minimum staffing levels are made up by “automatic aid” responses from neighboring fire districts/departments.
- Fire District 41 contains the Kenmore-Kirkland Joint Study Area and contracts with the City to provide fire and emergency services. As of 1999, for the entire Kirkland Fire Department service area, there are 64 uniformed personnel (including lieutenants, captains, battalion chiefs, deputy fire chief and fire chief). The number of firefighters per capita equals one firefighter per 1,200 population, assuming 60 firefighters, lieutenants, captains, and battalion chiefs.
- In 1998, average response time district-wide in Fire District 41 was 5.04 minutes.
- District 41’s Station 24 is located immediately east of the Kenmore-Kirkland Joint Study Area and is staffed daily for 12 hours by uniformed personnel and for 10.5 hours by reserve volunteers.

Impacts

- Under Alternative 1, assuming a household size of 2.4, one could expect 34,162 persons total in the Planning Area in 2020. The net increase in population for Alternative 1 would equal 12,932. Assuming that the Fire District 16 staffing level would be maintained and assuming the inclusion of the Joint Planning Areas, the population would require the District to have 14 additional firefighters to serve Kenmore. This does not address population increases elsewhere in the Fire District such as Lake Forest Park, or unincorporated areas of the District.
- Under Alternative 2, assuming a household size of 2.4, one could expect 35,414 persons total in the Planning Area in 2020. The net increase in population for Alternative 2 would equal 14,184. Assuming that the Fire District 16 staffing level would be maintained and assuming the inclusion of the Joint Planning Areas, the population would require the District to have 15 additional firefighters to serve Kenmore. This does not address population increases elsewhere in the Fire District such as Lake Forest Park, or unincorporated areas of the District.
- Under the Preferred Alternative, assuming a household size of 2.4, one could expect 35,119 total persons in the Planning Area in 2020. The net increase in population would equal 13,889. Assuming the Fire District 16 staffing level would be maintained and assuming the inclusion of the Joint Study Areas, the population would require the District to have 15 additional firefighters to serve Kenmore. This does not address population increases elsewhere in the Fire District such as Lake Forest Park, or unincorporated areas of the District.

Mitigation

- All new developments would be required to meet Uniform Building and Fire Code requirements for built-in fire protection systems (alarm and sprinkler systems).
- Street improvements would provide better access for emergency vehicles.
- Prior to construction, a plan for response to accidents and other emergencies would need to be developed for each development and redevelopment project. Areas of concern would be potential trench or structural collapses and access to tall structures.
- Goal 45 of the Comprehensive Plan states: “Support and provide a high level of police protection, fire suppression, and emergency services.”

Objective 45.2: “Support the fire service provider in its efforts to provide a fire and emergency medical response system sufficient to meet the community’s public safety needs.”

Objective 45.3: “Establish an emergency management office and system.”

Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

No significant unavoidable adverse fire protection or emergency service impacts would be anticipated with development under Alternative 1, No Action, or Alternative 2, Modified Plans, or the Preferred Alternative.

Library Services

Affected Environment

Please refer to **Chapter 9, Public Services Element**, for further information. Basic findings include:

- The Kenmore Small Branch Library is 2,112 square feet, has 29,000 volumes, computer access to electronic databases and resources, and access to the Internet. In 1998, nearly 93,000 items were checked out from the Library.
- Considering Kenmore's 2000 OFM population estimate of 16,890 and the current size and volumes of the library, the library provides 0.13 square feet per capita and 1.717 volumes per capita. The Library does not have a quantitative level of service to help determine when a library should be expanded to a larger branch level. The KCLS uses a qualitative approach and uses written descriptions of the services each branch should provide.
- Residents in the area also use the Bothell Regional Library, the Lake Forest Park Medium Library, and the Kingsgate Large Library Branches.
- Kenmore is in the Northshore Planning Area of the Library's The Year 2000 Plan. Based on a 1997 population of 101,500, the ratio of square footage to population was 0.367 and the ratio of volumes to population was 3.261. Due to expected population increases in the year 2000 to 114,800, the ratios of square footage and volumes are expected to decrease to 0.324 and 1.890 respectively.
- For the Kenmore Branch, the King County Library System (KCLS) is considering a several potential capital projects, one of which may include expansion of the Kenmore Library in the year 2010. The KCLS is considering two potential sizes for the facility, 5,250 square feet or 10,000 square feet. The City could accelerate this timeline if it decided to create a capital facilities district or use councilmanic debt.

Impacts

- Under Alternative 1, assuming a household size of 2.4, one could expect 34,162 persons total in the Planning Area in 2020. The net increase in population for Alternative 1 would equal 12,932. Assuming the Kenmore branch only, to maintain the current square foot per capita, an additional 1,680 square feet would be needed. To maintain the current volumes per capita, an additional 22,204 volumes would be needed. If the 5,250 square foot facility is built, the square foot per capita in the Planning Area would be 0.154, or if the 10,000 square foot facility is built, the square foot per capita would equal 0.293.
- Under Alternative 2, assuming a household size of 2.4, one could expect 35,414 persons total in the Planning Area in 2020. The net increase in population for Alternative 2 would equal 14,184. Assuming the Kenmore branch only, to maintain the current square foot per capita, an additional 1,845 square feet would be needed. To maintain the current volumes per capita, an additional 24,354 volumes would be needed. The square foot per capita (Planning Area) would equal 0.148 or 0.282 for the 5,250 square foot or 10,000 square foot facility, respectively.
- Under the Preferred Alternative, assuming a household size of 2.4, one could expect 35,119 persons total in the Planning Area in 2020. The net increase in population for Alternative 2 would equal 13,889. Assuming the Kenmore branch only, to maintain the current square foot per capita, an additional 1,805 square feet would be needed. To maintain the current volumes per capita, an

additional 23,847 volumes would be needed. The square foot per capita (Planning Area) would equal 0.149 or 0.284 for the 5,205 square foot or the 10,000 square foot facility, respectively.

Mitigation Measures

- Goal 46 states: “Support the provision of quality education opportunities to the Kenmore Community.”

Objective 46.3: “Provide adequate library services in the community.”

Policy PS-46.3.1 “Maintain inclusion in the King County Library System District.”

Policy PS-46.3.2 “In partnership with the King County Library System, encourage increased local library services to the Kenmore community. Increase the library space and volumes per capita from the Year 2000 levels of 0.13 square feet per capita and 1.717 volumes per capita.”

Policy PS-46.3.3 “Encourage a Downtown location for a relocated, expanded library. Consider a combined City Hall, community center, and library in a Downtown location.”

Policy PS-46.3.4 “Support recommendations to increase partnerships with the City and School District, and increase technology and services to the community, contained in the 1999 “Kenmore Library Service Needs Assessment.”

Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

No significant unavoidable adverse library service impacts would be anticipated with development under Alternative 1, No Action, or Alternative 2, Modified Plans, or the Preferred Alternative.

Parks and Recreation

Affected Environment

Please refer to **Chapter 7, Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Element**, for further information. Basic findings include:

- At the time of this writing the City of Kenmore has completed negotiations with King County for the transfer of ownership of five County-owned parks: Linwood, Moorlands, Wallace Swamp Creek, Kenmore, and Tracy Owen Station Parks. The City has the option of contracting for parks maintenance services with King County on an annual basis. It is anticipated that the City will develop its own park maintenance standards and may elect to put this service out to bid.
- Including Linwood, Moorlands, Kenmore, and Tracy Owen Parks a total of 34.28 acres of local parks are available that can be used for active recreation. Acreage for Wallace Swamp Creek and Swamp Creek parks was not taken into account because both are passive in nature and have limited development potential. Kenmore’s current level of service is approximately 2 acres per 1,000 population. National Recreation and Park Administration (NRPA) Standards for neighborhood parks are for one to two acres per 1,000 residents and five to eight acres per thousand for community parks.
- According to NRPA standards, neighborhood parks should be located within 0.25 to 0.5 mile of the neighborhood they serve. At the time of this writing there are areas underserved by parks, most notably the northeast quadrant of the City.

- The Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission owns and operates St. Edward State Park, a 316-acre facility offering open space, trails, active recreation facilities, a swimming pool, and a gymnasium open for public use.
- The Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife owns and operates a 1.92-acre boat launch facility on the south shore of the Sammamish River near Kenmore Park.
- Kenmore is a part of a Parks and Recreation Service Area, whose taxing authority is being used to retire the debt associated with the construction of a regional Senior Center Facility in Bothell.
- Northshore School District playfields and playground equipment are available for public use when not previously booked for student use.

Impacts

General Citywide

- Under all Alternatives, the City would require additional acreage for local and neighborhood parks to meet national level of service recommendations.
- Under Alternative 1, assuming a household size of 2.4, one could expect 34,162 persons total in the Planning Area in 2020. The net increase in population for Alternative 1 would equal 12,932. To maintain a rate of 2 acres per thousand, the City would need to provide 26 additional acres of local parks. To increase the rate to 7 acres per thousand (neighborhood plus community standard), the City would need to provide 205 additional acres of local parks. Additional population would also increase the demand on regional and state facilities.
- Under Alternative 2, assuming a household size of 2.4, one could expect 35,414 persons total in the Planning Area in 2020. The net increase in population for Alternative 2 would equal 14,184. To maintain a rate of 2 acres per thousand, the City would need to provide 28 additional acres of local parks. To increase the rate to 7 acres per thousand (neighborhood plus community standard), the City would need to provide 214 additional acres of local parks. Additional population would also increase the demand upon regional and state facilities.
- Under the Preferred Alternative, assuming a household size of 2.4, one could expect 35,119 persons total in the Planning Area in 2020. The net increase in population for Alternative 2 would equal 13,889. To maintain a rate of 2 acres per thousand, the City would need to provide 28 additional acres of local parks. To increase the rate to 7 acres per thousand (neighborhood plus community standard), the City would need to provide 212 additional acres of local parks. Additional population would also increase the demand upon regional and state facilities.
- The above statistics regarding national standards for acres per 1,000 population, do not adequately address that local parks may serve neighborhood, community, and regional functions, or that regional and state parks, which have not been counted towards Kenmore's acres per 1,000 population, serve neighborhood and community functions. Additionally, public educational facilities also offer their facilities for public recreation during non-school hours. These have not been addressed in the current or future acres per 1,000 calculations for local parks. Last, because recreation facilities such as athletic fields often serve a broader area, it is difficult to assess the need for these facilities in Kenmore on a facility/1,000 population basis. Because the City will be the provider of local facilities, and plans to cooperate on a regional basis to establish regional standards and determine appropriate cost sharing for regional public recreation facilities, the more appropriate level of service for the City would be to focus upon the location and function of local parks. Under any Alternative, to address an

appropriate distribution of local parks in the community, parks would need to be added to the northwest Kenmore, northeast Kenmore, and central Kenmore, as well as pockets in southeast Kenmore.

Surface Water Management Plan

- The Draft Surface Water Management Plan associated with Alternative 2, or the **Final Surface Water Management Plan, 2001** associated with the Preferred Alternative proposes some surface water facilities in Kenmore, Swamp Creek, and Tracy Owen Parks to address regional and local surface water quality problems. Short-term impacts could include some inconvenience to park users during installation of water quality improvement features and long-term impacts could include a small reduction in space that is available to park users. Additionally, stormwater maintenance activities could affect Wallace Swamp Creek Park. For additional information, consult the **Final Surface Water Management Plan, 2001**.

Park Concept Plans

- Refer to the **Fish and Wildlife** section for a discussion of potential impacts due to park improvements.

Mitigation

General Citywide/Surface Water Management Plan

- Goal 38 of the Comprehensive Plan is “Protect environmentally sensitive areas, and improve and increase Kenmore's shoreline access, open space, and parks and recreation opportunities.”

Objective 38.1: “Prioritize the City’s park and open space maintenance, land acquisition, and recreational goals.”

- Goal 39 is “Protect and provide visual and physical access to open spaces, shorelines, and environmentally sensitive areas.”

Objective 39.1: “Prepare and implement a Shoreline Master Program consistent with the requirements of State law and the provisions of the approved Comprehensive Plan.

Objective 39.2: “Identify and prioritize undeveloped properties for public acquisition.”

Objective 39.3: “Provide a balance between habitat restoration, enhancement, and public access.”

Objective 39.4: “Connect open spaces with parks and trails to create a system of linear linkages between shorelines, parks and environmentally sensitive areas. Consider viewpoints, view corridors, easements, bikeways, and scenic drives when looking for linkages.”

Objective 39.5: “Maintain and enhance view corridors to Lake Washington and the Sammamish River.”

- Goal 40 is to preserve and enhance existing parks for public use and add new parks where appropriate in location and when funding sources are identified.

Objective 40.1: “Provide clean, well-maintained parks that are safe to use.”

Objective 40.2: “Develop a Citywide Parks Plan.”

Objective 40.3: “Establish park levels of service standards, and mechanisms to ensure that park facilities are provided as growth occurs.”

- Goal 41 is “Provide a full range of recreational opportunities for Kenmore residents.”

Objective 41.1: “Encourage Kenmore residents to utilize existing public, non-profit, and private recreational programs and resources and support the efforts of these organizations to provide additional opportunities.”

Objective 41.2: “Encourage multi-purpose use of school, special district, government, non-profit, and religious facilities for civic, cultural, recreational, educational, and other activities.”

Objective 41.3: “Identify potential gaps in the provision of recreational opportunities, and define what role the City of Kenmore should assume in the process to correct deficiencies.”

Objective 41.4: “Encourage surface water facilities and other public and private facilities and utilities to be integrated and designed to serve multiple purposes including serving as open space and recreation areas.”

- Also refer to **Stormwater** mitigation listed below in this EIS.

Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

No significant unavoidable adverse park and recreation impacts would be anticipated with development under Alternative 1, No Action, or Alternative 2, Modified Plans, or the Preferred Alternative since appropriate levels of service have been determined by City decisionmakers.

Police Services

Please refer to **Chapter 9, Public Services Element**, of this Comprehensive Plan for further information. Basic findings include:

- The national standard level of service is 2.5 officers per 1,000 population. Based upon 11.5 officers plus support services equaling 16.68 FTE's, Kenmore's existing level of service is about 0.99 officers per 1,000 population. At a level of 9 officers and support services totaling 14.95 FTE's (the City's service level at the time of incorporation) the level of service would equal about 0.89 officers per 1,000 population.
- In Kenmore, the crime rate dropped in 1999 compared with 1998. Part I crime appears to be lower in the first three quarters of 2000, and Part II crime appears to be higher, in comparison with 1999 figures.
- The Kenmore-Bothell and Kenmore-Kirkland Joint Study Areas are served by the King County Sheriff's Office Precinct 2. The number of calls by patrol district varies between the study areas, and is partly based upon the difference in size of the patrol districts.

Impacts

- Under Alternative 1, assuming a household size of 2.4, one could expect 34,162 persons total in the Planning Area in 2020. The net increase in population for Alternative 1 would equal 12,932. To

maintain the current level of service, 13 additional officers would be needed. To achieve the service level at the time of incorporation, the number of additional officers would equal 12. To increase the level of service to the recommended national standard, 69 additional officers would be needed.

- Under Alternative 2, assuming a household size of 2.4, one could expect 35,414 persons total in the Planning Area in 2020. The net increase in population for Alternative 2 would equal 14,184. To maintain the current level of service, 14 additional officers would be needed. To achieve the typical contract amount, the number of additional officers would equal 13. To increase the level of service to the recommended national standard, 72 additional officers would be needed.
- Under the Preferred Alternative, assuming a household size of 2.4, one could expect 35,119 persons total in the Planning Area in 2020. The net increase in population for the Preferred Alternative would equal 13,889. To maintain the current level of service, 14 additional officers would be needed. To achieve the typical contract amount, the number of additional officers would equal 12. To increase the level of service to the recommended national standard, 71 additional officers would be needed.

Mitigation

- Goal 45 of the Comprehensive Plan is “Support and provide a high level of police protection, fire suppression, and emergency services.”

Objective 45.1: “Provide and maintain a police system to meet the community’s public safety needs.

Policy PS-45.1.1 Provide and maintain a police system sufficient to meet the community’s safety needs:

- Provide a level of service of 0.89 officers per 1,000 residents including support services.
- Provide community crime education programs. Provide or encourage those programs or activities that stimulate neighborhood cohesiveness such as Neighborhood Watch programs, community clubs, and others.
- Include “Crime Prevention through Environmental Design” components in site design guidelines for new development per Policy LU-8.4.1.
- Policy LU-8.4.1 includes “Crime Prevention through Environmental Design” components in site design guidelines for new development. This includes techniques promoting mixed-use development where appropriate, visibility of activity areas from surrounding residences and uses, increased pedestrian-level lighting, use of low fences, see-through landscaping, visible building entrances, and other techniques.
- Policy H-26.2.1 is to “Encourage housing design and development that promotes public safety including ‘Crime Prevention through Environmental Design’ components as described in Policy LU-8.4.1.”
- Improvements to streets and the addition of new streets would improve access for emergency vehicles and could reduce emergency response times. Refer to Policy T-29.3.1 and T-29.3.2.

Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

No significant unavoidable adverse police protection impacts would be anticipated with development under Alternative 1, No Action, or Alternative 2, Modified Plans, or the Preferred Alternative, since appropriate level of service standards have been determined by City decisionmakers.

Schools/Education

Affected Environment

Please refer to **Chapter 9, Public Services Element**, in this Comprehensive Plan for further background. Basic findings include:

- The City of Kenmore and the Kenmore-Bothell Joint Study area are served by the Northshore School District.
- Northshore School District facilities within Kenmore are exceeding their permanent capacities. Kenmore, Moorlands, Lockwood, and Westhill Elementary Schools as well as Inglemoor High School are exceeding their capacity with portables.
- The District plans to add eight classrooms in groups of four to existing elementary schools in the next six years. Additional projects involve modernizing and remodeling existing facilities, renovating play fields and athletic fields, providing and upgrading technology, and replacing and upgrading building systems. Impact fees are currently collected for single-family developments to help fund growth-related improvements.
- The Northshore School District is investigating School District use of an historic five-story seminary building at St. Edward Park. Proposed is a special facility containing a conference center for school staff training and the public, an alternate Middle School focusing on technology and the arts, and a children's museum with regional links to other museums.
- The Lake Washington School District serves the Kenmore-Kirkland Joint Study Area. For Finn Hill Junior High and Juanita Senior High in that school district, recent enrollments exceed the permanent capacities, but not the total capacity including portables.
- New growth is anticipated to occur primarily in the general Redmond area rather than in the Juanita area. Additional construction in the Juanita area to accommodate growth is not included in the Lake Washington School District's Capital Facilities Plan. However, Thoreau Elementary is slated for modernization improvements in 2002.

Impacts

- Population growth in the City and the Kenmore-Bothell Joint Study area would result in an increased number of students entering the Northshore and Lake Washington School Districts. The number of students would be based on factors such as the amount of single-family housing units built in Kenmore and the number of multi-family units.
- Within the City and Kenmore-Bothell Joint Study Area, Alternative 1 would produce a net increase of 1,859 single-family dwellings, and 3,796 multi-family dwellings. Alternative 2 would produce a net increase of 1,759 single-family dwellings, and 4,418 multi-family dwellings. The Preferred Alternative would produce a net increase of 1,752 single-family dwellings, and 4,314 multi-family dwellings.

- Within the Kenmore-Kirkland Joint Study Area, both Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 would produce a net increase of 41 single-family dwellings, and 12 multi-family dwellings. The Preferred Alternative would produce 41 single-family dwellings and no multi-family units.
- **Table ENV-N** shows the increased number of students in each school district, using *average* student generation rates based on **Tables PS-I and PS-M** in the **Public Services Element, Chapter 9** of this Comprehensive Plan. Because Alternative 2 would result in more dwellings than Alternative 1, Alternative 2 would result in a larger increase in students in the Northshore School District. The Preferred Alternative is within the range of Alternatives 1 and 2. This will require additional classrooms and teachers to meet the Northshore School Districts level of service, which equals an average 23 students per classroom. The number of students generated in the Lake Washington School District is minimal, and may perhaps be accommodated by the District's growth projections that are updated with each 6-year Capital Facility Plan.

**TABLE ENV-N
STUDENT GENERATION**

SCHOOL LEVEL	NSSD AVERAGE STUDENT RATE/DU	ALT. 1 STUDENTS	ALT. 2 STUDENTS	PREFER-RED ALT. STUDENTS	LWSD AVERAGE STUDENT RATE/DU	ALT. 1/ ALT. 2 STUDENTS	PREFER-RED ALT. STUDENTS
K-6	0.221	1,250	1,365	1,341	0.2095	11	9
7-9	0.082	464	507	497	0.074	4	3
10-12	0.064	362	395	388	0.062	3	3

Source: Northshore School District and Bucher, Willis, & Ratliff Corporation

Mitigation

- Goal 46 of the Comprehensive Plan is "Support the provision of quality education opportunities to the Kenmore Community."

Objective 46.1: "Support public and private education providers in providing the best education for members of the community."

Objective 46.2: "Encourage diverse and continuing education opportunities."

- The goal of creating pedestrian-oriented streets could include sidewalks, bus pick-up areas for school children, and any accommodations necessary for children with special needs.
- Application of School District six-year capital facility plans, and adoption of impact fees, would address growth impacts.

Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

No significant unavoidable adverse education system impacts are anticipated with Alternative 1, No Action, or Alternative 2, Modified Plans, or the Preferred Alternative, since the school districts monitor and plan for growth in their six-year capital facility plans, and since appropriate impact fees are determined to address growth.

Stormwater

Affected environment

Please refer to the City of Kenmore **Final Surface Water Management Plan, 2001**, prepared in accordance with State and local requirements and published at the same time as this environmental assessment. This document identifies surface water quantity problems as well as potential solutions. Solutions vary between non-structural measures such as economic incentives for resource protection (acquisition of flooding or conservation easements, acquisition of floodplain or wetlands), land use management techniques (floodplain zoning ordinances, building codes, clearing and grading regulations), and structural methods such as improved conveyance systems and/or detention/retention facilities.

The Plan also addresses water quality problems and lists alternative solutions, focusing on high-volume arterial streets and neighborhoods that were developed without stormwater detention or water quality facilities. Currently the City is under no obligation to retrofit existing public facilities but water quality retrofitting requirements are anticipated under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) 4(d) rules being developed to protect salmon species in the Puget Sound region. Requirements for more stringent water quality improvement facilities are also anticipated under new federal National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Phase II requirements within the next five years.

Basic findings include:

- The City of Kenmore has five drainage basins: North Lake Washington (three sub-basins), South Lake Washington (two sub-basins), Swamp Creek (three sub-basins), Sammamish River (five sub-basins), and Juanita Creek (one sub-basin). Existing stormwater drainage facilities consist of roadside ditches and piped storm drain systems as well as detention, water quality, and sedimentation facilities.
- The City does not have a comprehensive storm sewer system and relies instead on numerous separate systems with individual discharges to small tributaries, Swamp Creek, the Sammamish River, and Lake Washington.
- The volume and quality of stormwater in the City of Kenmore are largely the result of rapid urbanization outside the Study Area as well as in the five drainage basins defined within City limits.
- Flooding has become severe in the Swamp Creek basin in recent years. Neighboring cities to the north and a large portion of unincorporated Snohomish County (14,551 acres) contribute to the volume of stormwater runoff reaching the Kenmore area. Stormwater management authorities from contributing jurisdictions have begun a series of meetings to determine the needs and costs associated with solutions to problems in the basin.
- Aside from Swamp Creek, the remaining basins have localized, specific drainage problems. Most are related to inadequately sized drainage channels and culverts, lack of drainage easements, inadequately maintained drainage swales, eroded streams, and/or lack of channels and swales for drainage. Categories of projects include those where problems result from flooding of natural waterways, those resulting from runoff from public roads and storm drainage systems, and those resulting from runoff from private roads and storm drainage systems.

Alternatives and Impacts

General Citywide

- Development results in rooftops, roads, parking lots, sidewalks, and driveways that make the affected watershed impervious to rainfall. Under any Alternative, additional impervious surfaces due to development could result in runoff overwhelming the existing drainage system, and would require, drainage improvements, such as culverts, curbs, gutters, open channels, or storm sewers to direct and convey the runoff.

Surface Water Management Plan

- Water *quality* problems are associated with high-use intersections along SR-522. The following tables present the most obvious and pressing problem areas, alternative solutions, and impacts that would result from each solution. Shading indicates the recommended improvements included in the **Final Surface Water Management Plan, 2001**.

TABLE ENV-O
STORMWATER QUALITY PROBLEMS AND SOLUTIONS

PROBLEM LOCATION	ALTERNATIVE 1	ALTERNATIVE 2	ALTERNATIVE 3	ALTERNATIVE 4
SR-522 between 56 th and 68 th Avenues NE (North Lake Washington Drainage Basin, Problem NLW-WQ1)	Build wetvault at SR-522 between 60 th and 62 nd and construct wetpond to treat runoff between 62 nd and 65 th . Includes 1400 feet new 12-inch pipe.	Construct wetpond in Log Boom Park for runoff between 56 th and 62 nd . Construct biofiltration swale for runoff between 62 nd and 65 th . Includes 2500 feet new 12-inch drain line and 1100 feet 18-inch pipe.	Construct two bio-filtration swales in Log Boom Park for runoff between 56 th and 62 nd , and third swale for run-off collected between 62 nd and 65 th . Includes 2500 feet new 12-inch drain and 1100 feet of 18-inch pipe.	Do nothing.
Impacts:	Construction under SR-522 could cause temporarily increased traffic congestion. There may be conflicts limiting the siting wetvaults and conveyance systems with other utilities.	Same as Alt. 1. Additional impacts may be to recreational features at Log Boom Park. Without mitigation construction near wetlands could have impacts.	Similar to Alt. 2 except that bioswales would have fewer impacts to site than construction of wetpond.	Continued water quality degradation from highway runoff.

PROBLEM LOCATION	ALTERNATIVE 1	ALTERNATIVE 2	ALTERNATIVE 3
SR-522 at 80 th Avenue NE (Swamp Creek Drainage Basin, Problem SC-WQ1)	Build underground wetvaults	Construct open wetponds in Swamp Creek Park	Do nothing

PROBLEM LOCATION	ALTERNATIVE 1	ALTERNATIVE 2	ALTERNATIVE 3
Impacts:	Work under SR-522 could cause temporary traffic congestion. Mitigation required to prevent erosion to waterway during construction.	Proposal requires permission from King County and could affect future parks plans or uses. Construction of ponds adjacent to Swamp Creek could have environmental impacts if not properly executed. Mitigation required to prevent erosion to waterway during construction. No long term impacts anticipated.	Continued and increasing impact to Swamp Creek from degraded water quality as a result of contamination from SR-522 runoff.

PROBLEM LOCATION	ALTERNATIVE 1	ALTERNATIVE 2	ALTERNATIVE 3	ALTERNATIVE 4
SR-522 and intersection at 68 th Avenue NE (Sammamish River Basin, Problem SR-WQ1)	Install oil/water separator.	Construct 10-acre foot wetpond. Includes diversion pipe from existing 30-inch pipe.	Construct 10-acre foot wetpond with retrofit to Juanita Drive bridge to convey bridge runoff to new pond.	Do nothing.
Impacts:	Construction under SR-522 could cause temporarily increased traffic congestion.	Construction under SR-522 could cause temporarily increased traffic congestion. Construction of a pond adjacent to the Sammamish River could have environmental impacts if not properly done. Mitigation required to prevent erosion to waterway during construction phase of work. No long term impacts anticipated.	Same as Alt 1.	Continued and increasing negative impact to Lake Washington from degraded water quality.

PROBLEM LOCATION	ALTERNATIVE 1	ALTERNATIVE 2	ALTERNATIVE 3
Juanita Drive at NE 170 th Street (Sammamish River Basin, Problem SR-WQ2)	Install coalescing plate oil/water separators	Construct a one acre-foot wetpond. This includes oil/water separator described in Alt. 1.	Do nothing.
Impacts:	Construction under SR-522 could cause temporarily increased traffic congestion.	Same as Alt. 1. Proposal could affect future park plans or uses in Kenmore Park. Construction of the wetpond, if not properly done, could negatively impact adjacent wetland. Mitigation required to prevent erosion to waterway during construction phase of work.	Continued and increasing negative impact to Lake Washington from degraded water quality.

- Water *quantity* problems are the result of the lack of stormwater management controls before the City became incorporated. Major problems identified in the **Final Surface Water Management Plan, 2001** and exceeding \$30,000 are included in Capital Improvement Projects in that document. Projects under \$30,000 are included in that document as Small Works and are not considered likely to have adverse environmental impacts. Alternative solutions and anticipated impacts are presented in the following tables. Shading indicates improvements recommended in the **Final Surface Water Management Plan, 2001**.

TABLE ENV-P
WATER QUANTITY PROBLEMS AND SOLUTIONS

PROBLEM LOCATION	ALTERNATIVE 1	ALTERNATIVE 2	ALTERNATIVE 3	ALTERNATIVE 4
Harbour Village Sediment Pond (North Lake Washington Basin, Problem NLW-P2)	City assumes maintenance of constructed ponds. Upper pond to be used as sedimentation facility.	Reconstruct ponds as open stream channel. Remove existing weir. Build stream channel from box culvert to lake with vegetated buffer.	Combines Alt. 1 and Alt. 2.	Do nothing.
Impacts:	A weir at the outfall of tributary 0056 to Lake Washington blocks salmonid access to the ponds and stream. If stream flows are effectively bypassed during construction and annual cleaning, impacts should be minimized. Mitigation required to prevent erosion to unnamed creek 0056 during construction phase of work.	Same as Alt. 1	Same as Alt. 1.	Sedimentation problems would continue.

PROBLEM LOCATION	ALTERNATIVE 1	ALTERNATIVE 2	ALTERNATIVE 3
NE 193 rd Pl. inefficient drain pipe (North Lake Washington Basin, Problem NLW-P3)	Regrade ditch and line with quarry spalls. Upsize existing storm drain in NE 193 rd Place.	Construct tightline from pipe outfall to NE 193 rd Pl. Upsize existing storm drain in NE 193 rd Pl.	Do nothing
Impacts:	Disturbance to the steep slopes during construction may be a concern. An HPA may be needed for replacing the outfall to tributary 0056 with a larger pipe. Mitigation required to prevent erosion to unnamed creek 0056 during the construction phase of work.	Same as Alt. 1.	Erosion would continue.

PROBLEM LOCATION	ALTERNATIVE 1	ALTERNATIVE 2	ALTERNATIVE 3
Juanita Drive and NE 153 rd Pl. flooding (South Lake Washington Basin, Problem SLW-P1)	Construct 24-inch tightline under Juanita Dr., south of NE 153 rd St.	Construct 36-inch tightline under Juanita Dr., south of NE 153 rd St.	Do nothing.
Impacts:	Increased conveyance capacity in the piped system could overtax the stream segment located west of Juanita Drive and result in additional flooding of that parking lot. Because the project affects a natural stream, permitting restrictions may apply. Mitigation required to prevent erosion to Stream 0222 during the construction phase of work.	Same as Alt. 1.	Flooding would continue.

PROBLEM LOCATION	ALTERNATIVE 1	ALTERNATIVE 2
74 th Avenue NE/NE 160 th Street (Sammamish River Basin, Problem SR-P5)	Construct HDPE tightline to toe of slope. Construct HDPE tightline for storm drain outfall from 74 th Ave NE at NE 160 th Street to creek at toe of slope. (Tullar problem from "Wildcliffe Shores Drainage Investigation")	Do Nothing Allow surface flows from public street to continue to erode slope at pipe outfall.
Impacts:	No long-term negative impacts are expected result from this solution. Construction will impact private and public property and could impact Tributary 0057C if construction runoff is not properly managed.	Ongoing erosion and sedimentation impact to Tributary 0057C.

PROBLEM LOCATION	ALTERNATIVE 1	ALTERNATIVE 2	ALTERNATIVE 3
Inglewood Highlands (Sammamish River Basin, Problem SR-P1A)	Upsize outlet storm sewer from 18-inch to 24-inch from NE 164 th St. to Juanita Dr. Upsize storm sewer from intersection of 163 rd St and 70 th Ave. to NE 164 th St. from 12-inch to 18-inch. Refurbish control structure for plat detention pond.	Construct new 21-inch and 18-inch outfall storm sewer from intersection of NE 163 rd St. and 70 th Ave. NE to Juanita Dr. at NE 163 rd St. to divert plat runoff away from under-sized storm drain. Refurbish control structure for plat detention pond.	Do nothing.
Impacts:	During construction phase of work temporary impacts to traffic could occur. Residents at above addresses would be inconvenienced. No long term impacts are anticipated.	During construction phase of work temporary impacts to traffic could occur at specific intersections. No long term impacts are anticipated.	Environmental and infrastructure degradation will continue and increase until drainage issues are resolved.

PROBLEM LOCATION	ALTERNATIVE 1	ALTERNATIVE 2	ALTERNATIVE 3	ALTERNATIVE 4
Swamp Creek Flooding (Swamp Creek Basin, Problem SC-P1, as evaluated in the Surface Water Management Plan and Swamp Creek Flood Reduction Study) ¹	<p>Provides up to 10-year flood protection using varying combinations of structural solution elements, including improvements to the overflow channel along the Kenmore Elementary access road, main channel improvements, and a woody debris removal structure.</p> <p><i>Alt. 1A</i> includes the elements listed above.</p> <p><i>Alt. 1B</i> also includes solution elements to reduce flooding that originates in Wallace Park, and removal of a woody debris jam.</p>	<p>Provides 100-year flood protection using varying combinations of structural and non-structural solution elements, including solution elements to reduce flooding that originates in Wallace Park, elements to address a flow constriction at 73rd Avenue NE, improvements to reduce flooding in Muck Creek, reconstruction of 73rd Avenue NE above the floodplain, a woody debris removal structure, and raising the police precinct parking lot and park-and-ride access road above the floodplain.</p> <p><i>Alt. 2A</i> utilizes berming and elevating houses, but proposes no capacity improvements at 73rd Ave.</p> <p><i>Alt. 2B</i> also includes a box culvert at 73rd Avenue NE to increase capacity.</p> <p><i>Alt. 2C</i> includes a new bridge at 73rd Avenue NE to increase capacity and a combination of buyouts and floodproofing east of 73rd</p> <p><i>Alt. 2D</i> relies on property buyouts to reduce flood damage.</p>	<p>Provides 100-year flood protection using a combination of structural and non-structural solution elements similar to Alt. 2C, but does not address private property flooding east of 73rd Avenue NE. This alternative relies on future FEMA buyouts or floodproofing funded by individual property owners.</p> <p>Solution elements in this alternative include repair of the Wallace Park stream bank failure, construction of a sediment pond overflow spillway, berming to protect Muck Creek from Swamp Creek flows, Swamp Creek main channel improvements, berming along the north side of the Kenmore Elementary School access road, replacement of the 73rd Avenue NE bridge, removal of a woody debris jam, installation of a woody debris removal structure, Muck Creek and Northshore Utility District culvert improvements, and reconstructing 73rd Avenue NE above the floodplain, and raising the police precinct parking lot and park-and-ride access road above the floodplain.</p>	Do nothing.

PROBLEM LOCATION	ALTERNATIVE 1	ALTERNATIVE 2	ALTERNATIVE 3	ALTERNATIVE 4
Impacts:	Erosion and sedimentation could result from bank restoration, channel widening, and woody debris jam removal activities if not conducted with care. Permitting for a woody debris removal structure may not be possible under the ESA Salmonid 4(d) rule.	Erosion and sedimentation could result from bank restoration, channel widening, culvert installation, and woody debris jam removal activities if not conducted with care. Permitting for a woody debris removal structure may not be possible under the ESA Salmonid 4(d) rule. Property buyouts will require relocation of some residents. Temporary traffic impacts will result from work proposed in 73 rd Avenue NE.	Erosion and sedimentation could result from bank restoration, channel widening, culvert installation, and woody debris jam removal activities if not conducted with care. Permitting for a woody debris removal structure may not be possible under the ESA Salmonid 4(d) rule. Property buyouts will require relocation of some residents. Temporary traffic impacts in 73 rd Avenue NE will result from bridge construction in 73 rd Avenue NE.	Frequent flooding of private and public properties will continue. Occasional traffic blockages will occur when Swamp Creek floodwaters cover public streets.

¹An alternate solution of a new outlet cover from the Northshore Utility District headquarters to the Sammamish River was evaluated as part of the SR-522 Pre-Design process and in the **Swamp Creek Flood Reduction Study**. It was not recommended ultimately due to cost and utility constraints.

- Flooding in the Swamp Creek Basin is to be addressed through an **Interlocal Agreement** between the City and upstream jurisdictions. It is recommended that the Agreement address the following elements: Overall water quantity and quality management; maintenance of constructed and natural drainage systems; regulation and enforcement of new development activity; enforcement of rules for existing development; acquisition and management of wetlands and stream-related development; acquisition of properties suitable for regional detention; planning, design, construction of needed capital facilities; funding.

Mitigation

Surface Water Management Plan

- The **Final Surface Water Management Plan, 2001** contains recommended solutions related to stormwater quantity and surface water quality problems.
- Constructed solutions to drainage problems will be subject to public review on a case-by-case basis by agencies such as the Puget Sound Water Quality Authority, the Department of Ecology, and King County Department of Natural Resources as well as other interested agencies. Specific mitigation measures will be determined at that time.
- For those water quality improvement projects that could potentially be installed in Tracy Owen, Kenmore, or Swamp Creek parks, negotiations would be held with City and/or King County parks department staff to determine the alternative best suited for each site. (See Objective 42.9, below.)
- Proposed development is concentrated in the Downtown area, reducing impacts to outlying areas.

- For Alternative 2, or the Preferred Alternative, the Public/Private Institution designation of parks and open space would help maintain current uses and would reduce development potential in these areas.
- Retrofitting water quality improvement facilities in public parks would provide an opportunity for public education benefits on the need for stewardship of water resources.
- Goal 42 of the Comprehensive Plan is to “Develop and maintain a surface water system that serves the community, enhances the quality of life, and protects the environment.”

Objective 42.1: “Strive to protect lives and public and private property from flooding.”

Objective 42.2: “Protect wetlands and streams from degradation due to encroachment, filling, piping, ditching, poor water quality, and high peak flows.”

Objective 42.3: “Protect slopes from erosion and sliding due to improper surface water management.”

Objective 42.4: “Reduce negative impacts of past development, including roadways, on the man-made drainage system, the natural drainage system, and Lake Washington.

Objective 42.5: “Encourage infiltration and retention or provision of pervious surfaces.”

Objective 42.6: “Ensure the proper function of the City’s drainage system.”

Objective 42.7: “Ensure facilities are provided to reduce water quantity and quality impacts associated with new development.”

Objective 42.8: “Encourage establishment of regional surface water management facilities.”

Objective 42.9: “Seek opportunities to design and implement surface water management facilities that are functional, serve as amenities, and serve multiple purposes.”

Objective 42.10: “Encourage citizen participation through a collaborative approach to address surface water problems.”

- Goal 48 states: “Ensure that all households are served or can be served by water and sanitary sewer utilities at accepted service levels.”

Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

Additional development adding impervious surfaces could alter stormwater volumes at various locations in the City. Existing water quantity problems would be addressed with Alternative 2, and particularly the Preferred Alternative with its more refined solutions to the Swamp Creek basin problems, but not by Alternative 1. All Alternatives address stormwater requirements for new development, but Alternative 2, or the Preferred Alternative, would strengthen these requirements.

Even with mitigation, runoff from built surfaces would contain some level of sediments and pollutants of the type normally associated with urban runoff. These would be conveyed into drainage ways and wetlands in the study area. All three Alternatives include surface water regulations, although Alternative 2, or the Preferred Alternative, would strengthen these regulations and recommend retrofitting existing road facilities with water quality treatment. To the extent that future regulations (adopted by the City of Kenmore in response to the Endangered Species Act 4(d) rule, or in response to other federal, State, or local laws) would address water quality requirements, it may be possible to further minimize surface

water impacts. The level of significance of surface water impacts would be more precisely determined through project-specific environmental review.

Water/Wastewater

Affected environment

Please refer to **Chapter 10, Utilities Element**, of this Comprehensive Plan for further background. Basic findings include:

- The Northshore Utility District provides public water service to the entire City of Kenmore, the Kenmore-Bothell Joint Planning Area, and the Kenmore-Kirkland Joint Planning Area. The District has recently completed the 2000 Water System Comprehensive Plan.
- The Northshore Utility District currently obtains all its water from Seattle Public Utilities (SPU) through connections to the Tolt Pipeline No. 1, one connection to the Tolt Eastside Supply Line, and one connection to the Maple Leaf Supply Line. The current water supply contract with SPU expires in 2011. As a result, the District is currently evaluating various alternate supply options for insuring a continued reliable supply.
- Seattle Public Utilities initiated construction of an additional pipeline along the existing Tolt Pipeline alignment beginning in 2000 with completion expected in 2002.
- The Northshore Utility District provides public sewer service to the entire City of Kenmore as well as the Kenmore-Bothell and Kenmore-Kirkland Joint Planning Areas. The District's 2000 Wastewater Comprehensive Plan recommends projects for the 2000-2020 time frame covering the extension of trunk and gravity lines to serve growing populations and unsewered areas. It also calls for increasing capacity of three pump stations, eliminating two pump stations that can be served by gravity, as well as measures to increase emergency preparedness and reduction of inflow and infiltration by replacing or rehabilitating aging mains.
- King County Department of Natural Resources, Wastewater Treatment Division operates regional facilities within Kenmore. At the time of this writing, three projects are planned to occur in the Kenmore area include: the Swamp Creek Trunk Extension, the Northlake Interceptor, and an upgrade to the Kenmore Pump Station (emergency generator).
- In 1999 the County adopted an update to the Regional Wastewater Comprehensive Plan, which includes several major wastewater projects that will have varying impacts on Kenmore. The City will need to work out an agreement with King County with regard to mitigation of short-term construction and long-term operation impacts.

Impacts

- For Alternative 1, urban growth will result in increased demand for water and sewer service. Based on Utility District criteria, and using a residential water demand at a rate of 90 gallons per person per day, the projected population of 34,162 in the Planning Area would require approximately 3,074,580 gallons per day. For Alternative 2, the projected Planning Area population of 35,414 would require 3,187,260 gallons per day. For the Preferred Alternative, the projected Planning Area population of 35,119 would require 3,160,710 gallons per day.
- Using Utility District criteria of residential wastewater rates of 74 gallons per person per day, the projected Planning Area population of 34,162 under Alternative 1 would discharge approximately

2,527,988 gallons of sewage per day. For Alternative 2, the projected Planning Area population of 35,414 would generate 2,620,636 gallons of sewage per day. With the Preferred Alternative, the projected Planning Area population of 35,119 would generate 2,598,806 gallons of sewage per day.

- The above demand estimates would decrease if the District's household size estimates were used, resulting in lower populations. Refer to the **Land Use Plans** Section.

Mitigation

- It is anticipated that few new water supply delivery lines or wastewater removal lines would have to be added to the existing system to accommodate growth because concentration of development in the Downtown area would minimize the need to add new distribution or removal facilities. However, utility line sizes may need to be increased Downtown depending on the location of concentrated growth in relation to local lines. Utility improvements would be subject to environmental review prior to their construction.
- Goal 48 of the Comprehensive Plan states: "Ensure that all households are served or can be served by water and sanitary sewer utilities at accepted service levels."

Objective 48.1: "Coordinate with the Northshore Utility District, the King County Department of Natural Resources Wastewater Treatment Division, and the City of Seattle to ensure that sufficient sanitary sewer infrastructure and treatment, water supply, infrastructure, and fire flow are available or can be provided to all areas of the community to meet existing and future needs and to protect environmental quality."

- Goal 51 is to "Encourage resource and energy conservation."

Objective 51.1 states: "Promote and support water conservation efforts."

Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

Since water and wastewater system capacities would be determined prior to development approval, and since there will be coordination with the Utility district regarding growth estimates, significant unavoidable adverse impacts would not be anticipated with Alternative 1, No Action, or Alternative 2, Modified Plans, or the Preferred Alternative.

Solid Waste

Affected Environment

Please refer to **Chapter 10, Utilities Element**, of this Comprehensive Plan for further background. Basic findings include:

- King County assumes a rate of 0.78 tons of waste generated per resident per year, although the amount actually collected by Eastside Disposal is somewhat lower. The number of Eastside Disposal customers is less than the number of occupied housing units. Based on King County generation rates, Kenmore's population in 2000 generated 13,174 tons of solid waste.
- The City of Kenmore has elected to allow the state to continue to regulate the private hauler that serves the City. The City has no immediate plans to establish a franchise, but may wish to establish one at some point in the future. The garbage/recycling service provider to Kenmore and both Joint Study Areas is Eastside Disposal.

- Refuse from transfer stations trucked to the Cedar Hills Landfill. According to King County, the Cedar Hills Landfill has capacity until 2013. After the landfill reaches capacity, the County most likely would export its waste elsewhere, rather than add another new landfill within the County.
- In Kenmore, recycling collection services are provided to single-family and multi-family residences. Recycling material is collected and taken to the Rabanco Recycle Plant in Seattle. Yard waste is collected at curbside and taken to Cedar Grove Compost where it is composted and then sold for use in gardens and flower beds.

Impacts

- For Alternative 1, 12,932 new residents living in the City and Joint Study Areas by 2020 would generate roughly 10,087 additional tons of waste per year.
- For Alternative 2, 14,184 additional residents living in the City and Joint Study Area would generate about 11,064 additional tons of waste per year.
- Under the Preferred Alternative, 13,889 additional residents in the City and Joint Study Area would generate 10,833 additional tons of waste per year.
- A greater number of multi-family residential units would be proposed in a centralized area, reducing collection time and effort.

Mitigation Measures

- Goal 49 of the Comprehensive Plan is to “Provide solid waste collection and disposal services to the community consistent with solid waste management plans.”

Objective 49.1: “Monitor the delivery of solid waste services provided by King County and waste handlers to ensure appropriate service levels are provided at a reasonable cost.”

Objective 49.2: “Establish a municipal solid waste plan.”

- Goal 51 is to “Encourage resource and energy conservation.”

Objective 51.2: “Encourage solid waste reduction and recycling.”

- King County Solid Waste Division offers grants to cities to establish city-sponsored waste reduction and recycling projects. At the time of this writing Kenmore had not yet participated, but may wish to consider participation in the future. The County also sponsors a “Greenworks” Business Recycling Program to help businesses and institutions develop and expand waste prevention and recycling programs. The City could consider working with this program as well.

Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

No significant unavoidable adverse solid waste disposal impacts would be anticipated with development under Alternative 1, No Action, or Alternative 2, Modified Plans, or the Preferred Alternative as the City intends to monitor, coordinate, and plan for solid waste services with appropriate agencies.

REFERENCES

- City of Bothell (June 30, 1997). Imagine Bothell...City of Bothell Comprehensive Plan. Bothell, WA.
- City of Kenmore (1999). Draft Comprehensive Plan Inventory. Prepared by Bucher, Willis & Ratliff Corporation, et al. Kenmore, WA.
- City of Kenmore (2001). Swamp Creek Flood Reduction Study. Prepared by Kato & Warren, Inc. Kenmore, WA.
- Common Ground (Spring 2000). City of Kenmore Year 2000 Housing and Community Development Needs Assessment. Kenmore, WA.
- King County (1998). King County Surface Water Design Manual. Seattle, WA.
- King County (December 1990). Sensitive Areas Map Folio. Seattle, WA.
- King County Department of Development and Environmental Services (November 1997). LakePointe Mixed Use Master Plan, Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement. Prepared by Huckell/Weinman Associates, Inc. Seattle, WA.
- King County Department of Development and Environmental Services (July 1998). LakePointe Mixed Use Master Plan, Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement. Prepared by Huckell/Weinman Associates, Inc. Seattle, WA.
- King County, Department of Natural Resources, Wastewater Treatment Division (1999). Regional Wastewater Comprehensive Plan. Seattle, WA.
- King County, Department of Natural Resources (February 1997). Swamp Creek Action Plan. Seattle, WA.
- King County Growth Management Planning Council (December 31, 1995). Countywide Planning Policies. Seattle, WA.
- King County Library System (September 1998). The Year 2000 Plan. Seattle, WA.
- King County, Office of Budget and Strategic Planning (1994: with 1997 Updates). The 1994 King County Comprehensive Plan. Seattle, WA.
- Northshore Utility District (January 2000). 2000 Water System Comprehensive Plan. Prepared by Gray and Osborne, Inc.
- Northshore Utility District (March 2000). 2000 Wastewater Comprehensive Plan. Prepared by Gray and Osborne, Inc.
- Puget Sound Regional Water Quality Authority (1994). 1994 Puget Sound Water Quality Management Plan. Olympia, WA.
- Snohomish County (1994). Swamp Creek Watershed Management Plan. Everett, WA.

Snohomish County, Planning and Development Services (September 12, 2000). Snohomish County GMA Comprehensive Plan Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement: 2000 Consolidated Docket. Everett, WA.

Sundberg, Charlie (November 12, 1999). Personal Communication, correspondence from Charlie Sundberg, King County Office of Cultural Resources, to Lisa Grueter, Bucher, Willis & Ratliff Corporation.

